FRIEDRICH HEBBEL.

GERMANY owes the peculiar position she occupies in the history of the modern drama and theatre to her failures rather than to her successes. The pioneer, the innovator in the theatre never enjoys success, not, at least, if his innovations are of the kind that matters. The stage is too essentially a democratic institution to tolerate writers who do not adapt themselves to the tastes and understanding of the many; and the gifted German dramatists of the nineteenth century have been in too many cases unfortunate, wrong-headed poets, restless geniuses, who were never content merely to win the popular ear, but who rather courted failure by clinging obstinately to impracticable ideals. Of these unsuccessful dramatic geniuses who have given motor force to the modern drama, one of the least successful in his lifetime, and yet perhaps the most original of modern Europe, is Christian Friedrich Hebbel, whose hundredth birthday has just been celebrated throughout Germany. We do not propose to claim for Hebbel a place in the very front rank of dramatic poets; we would not even place him on the same level with the three or four acknowledged masters of the German drama; and his work has never been really popular on the German stage. But within the past ten years attention has been concentrated on him in Germany to an extraordinary degree. Professor R. M. Werner, the chief authority on Hebbel, has given us an admirable 'historical-critical' edition of his works, diaries and letters, which might well serve as a model of how a nineteenth-century poet should be edited, an edition which is at present being reprinted in a somewhat modified form in honour of the centenary of the poet's birth[1]; and a vast literature, which it is difficult to keep pace with, has grown

[1] *Friedrich Hebbels Sämtliche Werke.* Historisch-kritische Ausgabe besorgt von Richard Maria Werner. 16 vols. Berlin, B. Behr, 1912–13. Professor Werner's biography of Hebbel, which was first published in 1905, has just appeared in a second edition (Berlin, E. Hofmann).

up round Hebbel[1]. There are excellent monographs on him in French[2], and even in Danish and Italian[3]. To set against this we can point to nothing on Hebbel in English except a few exclusively academic studies[4]. But Hebbel is a power that must be reckoned with. He has, if we are not mistaken, meant more for the higher drama of Europe than any other German dramatist—more than Schiller or Goethe, more than Kleist or Grillparzer; and his plays are fraught with deeper significance for the theatre of the twentieth century than they were for that of his own time. It is from this point of view that we propose to examine his work in the following pages.

In Hebbel's childhood and youth there is something that reminds the English reader of the stubborn determination amidst untoward conditions, which distinguished the lives of so many Scotchmen of the last century who fought their way to the front. He was born in the town—it had then something over twelve hundred inhabitants—of Wesselburen in Holstein on the 18th of March, 1813, about a month later than Otto Ludwig and two months before Richard Wagner. Hebbel's father was a mason, and the family never rose above a hand-to-mouth existence; but schooling the boy had of a kind, and a warm-hearted teacher helped him as best he could. Young Hebbel was not unhappy, but the poverty and cares of the household imprinted themselves deeply on his impressionable mind and gave him that melancholy earnestness which clung to him through all his life. The father, however, threw a shadow over the child's life; every childish pleasure was met with a frown; he did not approve of the boy's modest schooling, opposed his love of books and only desired to see him old enough to place stone on stone like himself. 'My father really hated me,' wrote Hebbel in later years, 'and I could not love him either; at bottom, a well-intentioned, kindly man, poverty had taken the place of his soul.' In 1827 he died, leaving the family in deeper need than before, but the boy was at least free to face the world in his own way.

[1] Cp. H. Wütschke, *Hebbel-Bibliographie. Ein Versuch.* (*Veröffentlichungen der deutschen bibliographischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. VI.) Berlin, 1910.

[2] The most recent is the exhaustive monograph by André Tibal, *Hebbel, sa vie et ses œuvres de* 1813 *à* 1845. Paris, Hachette, 1911. Hebbel's *Maria Magdalene* was performed in Paris a few months ago—as far as we are aware, the first of the poet's dramas to be seen on the non-German stage—in the translation of M. Paul Bastier.

[3] C. Behrens, *Friedrich Hebbel, hans Liv og Digtning*, Copenhagen, Salmonsen, 1905; A. Farinelli, *Hebbel e suoi Drammi.* Bari, G. Laterza, 1912.

[4] We think especially of the valuable study by Miss Annina Periam of *Hebbel's Nibelungen* in the *Columbia University Germanic Studies*, New York, 1906. To Professor A. Gubelmann's recent *Studies in the Lyric Poems of Friedrich Hebbel*, New Haven, Conn. 1912, we hope to return.

His teacher obtained for him a modest post with the parish clerk of Wesselburen, and here Hebbel remained for the next eight years of his life. In these years he read much—as much, at least, as the resources of Wesselburen could afford him—and since his fourteenth year he had written verses which found acceptance in a local newspaper. By the time, however, that he had reached the age of eighteen or nineteen, he began to chafe against the bars of his cage; he looked anxiously for some means of escape from the narrow world in which he was imprisoned. Meanwhile the acquaintance with Uhland's poetry brought him another step forward; he even wrote to Uhland, without, however, getting any real help or encouragement. At last, the editress of a Hamburg newspaper, to which Hebbel had, for some years, sent contributions in prose and verse, interested herself in him, with the result that on March 1, 1835, the young poet was at last able to turn his back on his birthplace, which he did not see again except for a brief visit in 1836.

The year Hebbel spent in Hamburg was one of varied experiences and not much happiness; he took lessons in Latin, with a view to equipping himself for a university career, but his studies did not make progress. More important was a friendship, which soon ripened into a closer intimacy, with Elise Lensing, a woman three years his senior, who, in the ensuing period of poverty and despair, proved to Hebbel a veritable guardian angel. Notwithstanding the extremely precarious state of his means and the insufficiency of his preparation, he set out at Easter, 1836, for Heidelberg, where, although not permitted to matriculate, he bravely began the study of law. The subject had not much attraction for him, and he found the pinch of poverty harder to bear among his student friends than it had been in Hamburg; he managed, however, to get through the term on 120 marks. It gradually became clear to him that he must give up the study of law; he resolved, consequently, to throw all his energy into finding a means of subsistence with his pen, and in September—the faithful Elise having succeeded in getting together a hundred talers for him—he started out for Munich, which, he believed, would afford him a better footing for a literary career. After a visit to Strassburg, he crossed the Black Forest to Stuttgart where he duly presented himself to influential literary men such as Gustav Schwab and Hermann Hauff, the editor of Cotta's *Morgenblatt*. The latter accepted Hebbel's offer to contribute to the journal periodical letters from Munich. With Uhland, whom he also visited, in Tübingen, he was disappointed, but, on the whole, this journey was

the happiest experience of his student-days, and he arrived in Munich on September 30, in the best of spirits.

And now began two and a half years of what might be called his real apprenticeship to literature. He made up for the lack of a proper education by wide reading and concentrated study—and that amidst almost incredible privations. A fellow-student, Emil Rousseau, whose early death in these years was a severe blow to him, and Josepha Schwarz, the daughter of a joiner in whose house he lodged, were the only real friends he possessed in Munich. For the rest, he lived in books and laid great plans for a literary career. He was too busily engaged absorbing to have much time for work of his own—a few stories written at the time show the influence of Jean Paul and Hoffmann—but before he left Munich it had become clear to him that his true calling was the drama. In March 1839, before the winter was over, Hebbel set out on foot for Hamburg; he made the journey through snow and storm, clad so miserably that it was hardly possible for him to command civil attention at the inns by the way; his sole companion was a little dog which, when its feet had become sore, he carried, sheltering it under his coat from the inclemency of the weather. There are no more profoundly touching pages in Hebbel's Diary than the record of this journey. On March 30, he met Elise, the only human being who stood in any way near to him, at Harburg, and the following day he reached Hamburg, which Elise was to make a home for him during the next four years. It was a period of restless fermentation that lay before him, of alternating hopes and disappointments, of new friendships, and wearing frictions with the literary and journalistic world; and in these years Hebbel laid the foundation of his reputation with two dramas, *Judith* and *Genoveva*.

Hebbel's *Judith*, like Schiller's *Räuber* in its day, was one of those incisive works that mark an epoch in literature. The future historian of the European drama might do worse than open the second great section of the nineteenth century with this tragedy; for it stands on the boundary line between Romanticism and modern realism. How Hebbel lighted upon the theme is not quite clear; possibly Gutzkow's *König Saul* stimulated his ambition to prove his mettle in a similar field. But it was characteristic of his genius that he should have selected a theme which, although a favourite with painters, had been sedulously avoided by every great dramatist in Europe. Schiller's remark about the story of Mary Stuart, that, as it had never been dramatised by any great poet, it must contain some serious flaw, might

be applied with more justification to *Judith*. For what the *Apocrypha* tells of the heroine of Bethulia is really only an anecdote and not even a tragic one. She goes forth, filled with the spirit of God, from the besieged town to the camp of Holofernes, refuses to touch meat or drink in a mystic belief in God's secret purposes with her, and takes advantage of Holofernes' drunken sleep to strike off his head. Hebbel felt instinctively that he could do nothing with this kind of heroism, and he proceeded to invent a psychological background for the story. Although a widow, Hebbel's Judith is only a widow in name, for a mysterious vision had interposed between her and her husband Manasse, and she had never really been his wife. This ambiguous state of his heroine was precisely what Hebbel, by a process of reasoning not easy to follow, needed to give the story a satisfactory dramatic conflict. Like Schiller's Maid of Orleans, whose success against the English depended on her ability to resist the lure of earthly love, Judith goes forth to free her people from the enemy's yoke. Decked out as a bride, she enters the camp of Holofernes; he is at once captivated by her, and she is also not insensible to the fascination of this overbearing type of manhood. The barbarian, rejoicing in the plenitude of his brutal strength, treats his prey with a superior, contemptuous condescension, even laughs in her face when she tells him she has come to slay him. He drags her into his tent and treats her as if she were no better than a bartered slave. Judith's outraged personality is aroused: the wrong that has been committed against her womanhood must be avenged. Not as the God-inspired patriot, but as the woman whose dignity and individuality have been shamefully trampled upon, she slays Holofernes. She returns to Bethulia, unable to share in her people's rejoicing; and the only reward she asks from her priests is that they will promise to kill her if she so desires it; for she will not be the mother of a son of Holofernes.

With its juvenile excesses and exaggerations, its stormy, unmeasured language and superhuman characters, *Judith* lies outside the sympathies of the modern reader, but it possesses merits which are not to be overlooked. The scenes, for instance, in which the people of Bethulia appear on the stage are among the most masterly presentations of the 'crowd' in modern literature; and not since the 'Storm and Stress' of the eighteenth century had such an incisive, nervous prose—a prose of brutal, outspoken force, as well as significant meaning—been heard in German theatres. It is to Judith herself, however, we must look for the peculiarly revolutionary character of Hebbel's first tragedy. The

various types in which womanly heroism had been embodied by dramatic poets in the past were, it might fairly be said, constructed out of universally human qualities; the mainsprings of their tragic guilt or tragic struggle—their passions, their virtues and vices, their baseness or nobility of soul—were common to both sexes. Now Hebbel's Judith is a dramatic heroine who is heroic through her womanhood alone, who rises to greatness by virtue of her sex. This is what makes her so significant an innovation in the dramatic literature of the first half of the nineteenth century. The poet has here, in an entirely new way, attempted to tap the headsprings of individuality, to get at the secret of personality. We have only to compare this Judith with the heroines of European tragedy in the preceding age and of Hebbel's own time, of Voltaire and Schiller, of Victor Hugo and Grillparzer, of Kleist and Grabbe, to realise the novelty of Hebbel's art; not since the naïver drama of our Elizabethans, had so original an effort been made to lay bare the hidden springs of human motive and action.

Like all innovators, however, Hebbel was only the spokesman of ideas which had been long in silent preparation. The origins of this new type of dramatic heroine may be traced in two literary movements which met together in that 'Young German School' from which Hebbel himself sprang. One of these was indigenous in Germany: the pronounced individualism of the Romanticists; while the other found its way into Germany from France and was a product of rationalism rather than romanticism, namely the emancipatory movement which is reflected in the novels of George Sand[1] and, to a certain extent, in those of Balzac. The Young Germans responded with alacrity to every hint that came from Paris, and they at once proceeded to graft this French conception of the emancipated, individualised woman on to the older German tradition, as it appears, for instance, in Friedrich Schlegel's unsavoury novel, *Lucinde*. Thus arose books like Gutzkow's *Wally die Zweiflerin*, Laube's *Das junge Europa* and Mundt's *Madonna*. But so effectually did Hebbel supersede the theoretic and anaemic creations of these writers that his *Judith* ultimately appeared as a direct challenge to the Young German attitude to women.

Whether it be that the first flush of success engenders foolhardiness, or whether, in the art of the drama, it is the second step and not that first which costs, the fact remains that Hebbel's second tragedy *Genoveva* did not meet with the success of *Judith*. But there is

[1] How deeply George Sand's novels impressed her German contemporaries is to be read out of Theodor Mundt's *Geschichte der Literatur der Gegenwart*, Berlin, 1842.

genuine poetry in this play—it is in verse, not in prose as *Judith* had been—and poetry of the same elemental kind as is to be found in its predecessor. Like *Judith*, it penetrates deep into the heart of things; it ignores the well-worn conventions of good and evil, and attempts to build up the moral world anew. Golo, not Genoveva, is the chief figure of Hebbel's tragedy, and this Golo is Hebbel's self. The dark-dyed evil-doer of the popular story has here become a Hamlet of passion; and the tragedy a study of an upright man of noble instincts, who is ruined by a passion that he is not strong enough to fight against. Thus *Genoveva* is an intimately personal drama, perhaps the most complete 'confession'—to use Goethe's word—that Hebbel has given us outside his diaries.

His next tragedy, *Maria Magdalene*, is connected by many threads both with *Judith* and *Genoveva*; it is a repetition of the sex-tragedy in a modern *milieu*. Here again a woman's fate conditioned by her own personal attitude to life rather than by her surroundings, occupies the centre of the picture. *Maria Magdalene* is a 'tragedy of common life,' and sought to revive a form of drama in which the German poets of the eighteenth century had attained high distinction. It was written for the most part in Paris, whither Hebbel had gone in the autumn of 1843 with the help of a pension granted him for two years by the king of Denmark: as a native of Holstein, he was by birth a Danish subject. It was characteristic of Hebbel that in Paris, a city which was at that time the Mecca of German writers, he should have been insensible to his surroundings, and have turned with preference to reminiscences of his early home life and his student days in Munich. *Maria Magdalene* is Hebbel's most naturalistic drama; the background, the characters, many of the incidents, are reproduced with close faithfulness to real life. Only the inner, spiritual conflict is bound up with, and perhaps one might add distorted by, Hebbel's unrealistic ethics. The first performance of *Maria Magdalene* in Leipzig in 1846 brought him, however, his only emphatic popular success.

It would be unfair to reduce *Maria Magdalene* to a dry synopsis of its plot; for the subjects of all 'tragedies of common life' are of necessity commonplace and melodramatic, and everything depends on the treatment. Hebbel has not succeeded in reconciling us to his melodrama; he has been too unsparing with death, and has not enveloped his heroine sufficiently with the persuasive power of sympathy to help us over the crux of the action—the crux which gives the play its scarcely justifiable title. Klara sacrifices coldly and voluntarily

her good name to a vague ideal of duty; she yields to her suitor Leonhard in order that she may feel better shielded against the temptation to return to an old love; and when Leonhard abandons her, her only way out of the dilemma is suicide. The heroine of the older domestic tragedy had met her fate because she was unable to reconcile passion and filial duty; the tragedy of Klara's life is a purely inward conflict between herself and a self-imposed ideal of morality. *Maria Magdalene* is thus, no less than the tragedy of *Judith*, the tragedy of the woman's individuality, the revolt of the individual against a tyrannical convention that would ignore or destroy it.

From Paris, Hebbel turned his steps to Rome and Naples, where he spent more than a year, which, as far as productive work was concerned, was unfruitful. His pension was not large enough, considering his obligations to Elise in Hamburg, to raise him very far above material want, and his belief that it might be renewed at the end of the second year was not fulfilled. In December 1845, once more broken in hopes, bankrupt in pocket and soul, Hebbel turned his steps to Vienna. Here he had the good fortune to meet with admiring friends and patrons; more than this, he found in Christine Enghaus, a prominent actress of the Hofburgtheater, a companion for the rest of his life, who brought peace to his tortured soul. To the objective onlooker this marriage—it took place on May 26, 1846—may have been, as poor Elise said, a 'deadly sin'; Elise, who had given him her last penny, had borne him children, had toiled for him, while he was drinking in new experiences and impressions in France and Italy, had every reason to curse Hebbel for his cruel abandonment of her. That he had never really loved her, as he insisted, was but a poor exoneration. And yet his marriage is one of those steps upon which the ordinary mortal may not sit in judgment in cold blood. Hebbel had been treated harshly by life; it had placed every possible obstacle in his way, and in its terrible school, he had learned to press ruthlessly forward. They are cruel words we find in Hebbel's Diary under the date of February 21, 1845: 'Shake everything off that hems you in your development, even if it be a human being who loves you; for what destroys you, can help no one else,' but for one whose conscience has imposed upon him a mission and a task in the world, they contain a deep truth. It is enough for us that this step, after years of struggle and privation, at last brought tranquillity into Hebbel's life, and gave us masterpieces like *Herodes und Mariamne*, *Agnes Bernauer*, *Gyges und sein Ring* and *Die Nibelungen*. Even on the purely human side, the fact that

Elise Lensing subsequently spent months under the Hebbels' roof in Vienna as a guest shows that the tragedy in her life was not wholly untempered.

Of all the subjects that Hebbel touched, none was so much the common property of the dramatists of Europe as the story of Herod and Mariamne; from Ludovico Dolce in the sixteenth century onwards, poets have returned again and again to the fascinating story which Josephus relates in the fifteenth book of his *Jewish Antiquities*. It was a theme peculiarly congenial to Hebbel's problem-loving genius. According to his wont, he aimed at making out of it a purely personal tragedy; he subordinated the political and historical elements of the story to the psychological. Hebbel's Herod is less the scheming despot, than the incarnation of a superhuman passion, which stretches out its greedy arms even beyond the grave. The ruthless tyrant has found in his love for Mariamne the one bright point in a life of turbulent unrest, and he guards that love with a jealousy that is stronger than life itself. Hebbel's play is, in fact, a tragedy of posthumous jealousy; Mariamne must die because Herod cannot brook the thought that she might become the wife of another. No less exceptional is Mariamne herself; the last of a great race, proud beyond all measure, she too loves with a passion that sees in death no barrier; for this great love is the only tie that binds her to life.

The first note of the tragedy is struck with Mariamne's cold distrust on learning that her brother had been drowned by her husband's orders. Herod is embittered and demands from her an oath that she will voluntarily follow him in death. This oath Mariamne refuses to take, not because she desires to outlive the man she loves, but because her pride is wounded that he should think a binding promise necessary. Herod fails to understand her refusal; a blinding jealousy takes possession of him—he pictures the Roman Emperor himself as his successor in his wife's affection—this is the motive for the order he leaves that, in the event of his not returning, Mariamne is to be put to death. When she learns of this injunction, she is stung to the quick, but she reflects that the order may have been given in a moment of passion. Herod returns after the appointed time and, finding Mariamne still alive, has his brother-in-law Joseph, who is responsible for the order not being carried out, executed. A second time Herod is obliged to leave Judaea, and his wife welcomes the journey, for now she confidently believes, her husband will trust her

to die of her own accord, should he not return. When she learns that the order has been repeated, that she has again been placed 'under the sword,' the last hope is crushed out of her; the veil falls from her eyes and she sees herself the wife of a heartless egoist; she is alone in the world, she has no further claim on life. Her first thought is to kill herself, but then a plan of more exquisite revenge flashes upon her. She orders for the very day on which the definite news of Herod is expected, a festival to be arranged. If he does return, he shall at least find her bedecked with jewels, dancing and rejoicing in his death. And the great moment of her triumph does come. Amidst all the gaiety, the sinister figure of Herod suddenly appears in the ball room. 'Der Tod!' she cries—words that have an unforgettable ring—

> Der Tod! Der Tod! Der Tod ist unter uns!
> Unangemeldet, wie er immer kommt!

Mariamne is thrown into prison and subsequently executed. Only when it is too late, does Herod learn of her innocence; his despair knows no bounds, and just at this moment comes the news of the Wise Men of the East who seek the new-born King of the Jews. His love, his wife, is gone—only his throne remains. That must be defended at all costs, and, as the drama closes, he issues orders for the Slaughter of the Innocents.

Regarded as a contribution to the literature of the theatre this subtlest and most enigmatic of all the dramatisations of the Jewish story labours under serious disadvantages. German critics have attempted to explain its want of stage-effectiveness by the incompatibility between historical fact and the psychological interpretation of it, by the want of harmony between the story and its grandiose spiritual background, that is to say, the passing of the old heathen world and the coming of Christianity. With more justice we might object that for a tragedy of superhuman love, there is so strangely little love in the play. Love is described, reflected upon, analysed; but it never rises up before us, real and plastic, as in *Romeo and Juliet,* in Grillparzer's *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen* or Wagner's *Tristan und Isolde*; we are obliged to take the poet's word for it that Herod and Mariamne love each other with a love that passes ordinary comprehension. It is only the metaphysics of passion which Hebbel gives us, the philosophical essence of love.

If, however, we once succeed in penetrating the somewhat forbidding shell, we find in *Herodes und Mariamne* a dramatic poem which embodies, as no other work of its kind, the intimate relationship

of two people bound to each other by the closest ties; *Herodes und Mariamne* is a tragedy of marriage, the tragedy of the frictions and misunderstandings, the distrusts and jealousies, the defiant pride and humiliating debasement, which can arise in every union between two sensitive souls. The unpardonable crime which Herod has committed against Mariamne is that he has degraded her, as she says, to a mere thing, to a possession; he has refused to acknowledge her rights as a human being. 'Du hast in mir,' she says,

> Du hast in mir die Menschheit
> Geschändet, meinen Schmerz muss jeder teilen,
> Der Mensch ist, wie ich selbst, er braucht mir nicht
> Verwandt, er braucht nicht Weib zu sein, wie ich....
> Doch ein Leben
> Hat jedermann und keiner will das Leben
> Sich nehmen lassen, als von Gott allein,
> Der es gegeben hat! Solch einen Frevel
> Verdammt das ganze menschliche Geschlecht,
> Verdammt das Schicksal, das ihn zwar beginnen,
> Doch nicht gelingen liess, verdammst du selbst!
> Und wenn der Mensch, in mir so tief durch dich
> Gekränkt ist, sprich, was soll das Weib empfinden,
> Wie steh' ich jetzt zu dir und du zu mir?

The drama thus resolves itself, like *Judith*, but in a subtler, more modern form, into a tragedy of individualism. But is it modern, one is tempted to ask, to involve historical characters in such unrealistic, artificial relations to each other? Is it modern to ask an audience to interest itself in men and women who always act as exceptions, who never feel or think what ordinary mortals would feel or think in the given circumstances? In these matters Hebbel reminds us of the power which Spinoza exerts as a thinker. Just as Spinoza's metaphysics is irrefutable, is a system of indisputable logical reasoning, as soon as one has admitted its first axioms, so there is no escape from Hebbel's psychological reasoning. We may rub our eyes, insist that we are only dreaming, we may appeal to common sense and smile at Hebbel's ingenious perversions of the most obvious experiences of life; but the fact remains that even a drama like *Herodes und Mariamne* is, as Hebbel himself said, 'a drama of the strictest necessity.' Only when our memory for details slackens, when the fine touches and the psychological premises are forgotten, does our common sense break rudely in, and the old conventional types of a Judith, a Genoveva, a Mariamne, assert themselves and blot out the delicate, iridescent creations of Hebbel's imagination.

It is impossible here to do more than hint at the range of Hebbel's

work in his ripest years. We have selected *Herodes und Mariamne* for more detailed notice, not because it is the best specimen of his workmanship, but because it illustrates that aspect of Hebbel's poetic creed which proved of greatest moment for the subsequent history of the drama, his plea for the rights of personality. But in every field he entered, he left the drama in a different condition from that in which he found it. His historical tragedy, *Agnes Bernauer* (1852), for instance, is in its way no less original than *Herodes und Mariamne.* The faithful dramatisation of history as such had little charm for Hebbel; he cared nothing for the humdrum sequence of causes and effects which the poet is only called upon to interpret. What interested him was the strange and unexpected; the themes he chose were those in which man attempted, by force or violence, to hold back the wheel of time, endeavoured to upset the order of the world, or to shake society out of its sleep of tradition. Tragedy meant in his eyes the consequence of some superhuman attempt to bring the established order of things out of its course. It is not the fate of Agnes Bernauer, as history relates it, that attracted Hebbel, but rather the opportunity, afforded by that fate, of illustrating an idea which he had long ruminated on, the tragic fate of beauty that is doomed to destruction merely because it is beautiful. That and the no less fascinating problem of the relation of the individual to the state, are the ruling ideas of the play. From the theoretical and aesthetic point of view, however, its most striking feature is Hebbel's wilful repudiation of the factor of sympathy, a repudiation which, no doubt, has militated against the success of the tragedy on the stage. *Agnes Bernauer* is in this respect a protest against a convention which has been responsible for quite as much spurious historical drama as that other convention, the love-interest, against which Voltaire protested in the eighteenth century.

Gyges und sein Ring, which appeared in 1856, is, to our thinking, Hebbel's masterpiece; it is, at least, his nearest approach to the suave, mellow classicism of which Grillparzer was then the first living master. The old anecdote of Herodotus, according to which King Candaules of Lydia insists on showing his lance-bearer Gyges Rhodope, his queen, in her naked beauty, in order to convince him that she is the fairest of women, was a subject exactly made for Hebbel's hand. In its original form the story was, of course, unpalatable to modern tastes; and Hebbel was not the man to introduce that touch of French piquancy with which Gautier, and Lafontaine before him, had

modernised it. Hebbel at once grasped the possibility of serious poetic symbolism in the theme; of employing it to illustrate his favourite thesis of the rights of personality. His Rhodope is a dreamy oriental, who has hitherto been shielded from all touch of the outside world, and is suddenly awakened by an unjustifiable intrusion on her privacy. She is another Judith or Genoveva, another Klara or Mariamne, but more finely delineated and with something of that facile grace of the women of the Spanish drama, at that time so popular on the Viennese stage. At bottom, all these heroines of Hebbel's are involved in a life and death struggle—spiritual rather than material—for their rights as individual members of the human race; and, one and all, they assert themselves by virtue of a common humanity, but a humanity that takes account of sex and personality. Well might one of Hebbel's critics say to him after this tragedy: 'Women should crown you as a modern "Frauenlob."'

And yet it must be confessed, there still clings to *Gyges* a distracting unnaturalness, an overwrought ingenuity; we are still pulled up unpleasantly by the absence of the common-sense outlook on life. Nowhere in his work has Hebbel shown himself such a master of dramatic construction as in this play, nowhere has he woven the armour of his logic more closely, nor revealed such insight into the ideal aspects of his problem. But the quality of felicitous poetic expression is strangely deficient. Hardly a line of Hebbel's verse —and we are thinking of his poetry as a whole—lingers in the memory, not one cadence haunts us: we miss in him the power of converting the common thoughts of common life into unforgettable music. There is, paradoxical as it may seem in so subtle a writer, a want of ideas in Hebbel's verse; he shows extraordinary ingenuity; he thinks strange, unusual thoughts, and he clothes them in striking metaphors and similes; but these remain the laborious work of the intellect, they are not the spontaneous intuition of the inspired poet. Hebbel has little sense for the lyric beauty of words, and he was equally deficient in what in Schiller often proved so admirable a surrogate, a grandiose theatrical rhetoric.

We believe the view is generally shared by Hebbel's countrymen that his last completed work, the trilogy of *Die Nibelungen*, is his masterpiece. But we doubt if this opinion can be maintained. Not but that he has shown remarkable skill in throwing the national epic of the Germans into dramatic form. There is a necessary drawing-together of events widely separated in time, there is an occasional

tactful alteration in the course of the story to suit dramatic needs or to avoid situations in the epic which might to-day appear merely repulsive; but in no essential has Hebbel departed from the original. He has woven his own modern fabric on to the rugged framework of the mediaeval poem; he has avoided scrupulously any subtle modernisation of its characters; their motives remain as clear and simple as in the epic itself, and rarely are we disturbed by Hebbelian paradoxes even in the dialogue. He has not, in other words, made a 'modern' drama out of the subject, such as Wagner did in his *Ring des Nibelungen.* He has not aimed at producing a drama embodying the thought and feeling of the middle of the nineteenth century; nor has he, like Gerhart Hauptmann in his *Der arme Heinrich*, attempted to bring the mediaeval *milieu* within the ken of the modern imagination with the aid of poetic mysticism. Thus the trilogy necessarily stands further away from us to-day than do Hebbel's other works. But Hebbel's Kriemhild is, none the less, one of the most majestic heroines of the modern theatre; he has succeeded—and it was no mean achievement—in creating out of the mediaeval barbarian of the later books of the *Nibelungenlied*, a humanly comprehensible, even sympathetic and lovable woman.

Of Hebbel's comedies we have left ourselves no room to speak; but it was a domain in which—in spite of his suggestive theories—he had virtually no success, either on the stage or off it. Hebbel was almost entirely destitute of humour. With less justification, we have said nothing of his lyric poetry, which, as might have been expected from such a writer, possesses an originality all its own. His *Tagebücher*, or Diaries, one of the most candid confessions of the intellectual life in modern literature, might provide material for an essay in themselves. But Hebbel the tragic poet necessarily stands in the foreground; and it is only now, when he has been fifty years dead—he died on December 13, 1863—that we have begun to realise how much he really meant for the drama of Europe in these fifty years. If the German drama has, in recent years, attained a pre-eminence over that of the rest of the continent, this has been in no small measure due to the fact that it has drawn its germinating ideas from Hebbel. Plays, for instance, like Sudermann's *Die Ehre* and *Heimat*, which depict the clashing of irreconcilable convictions vital to the social life of the individuals concerned, clearly point to Hebbel as their predecessor; and that power which the young writers of to-day in Germany possess in so high a degree, of rendering their immediate

and special conflict symbolic of a wider movement in human ideas, has also been learned from the older poet, whose tragedies are all provided with a suggestive spiritual background. The dependence of Sudermann's *Johannes* ('John the Baptist') on Hebbel's *Herodes und Mariamne* is, for instance, too obvious to need remarking. The indebtedness of the modern drama to Hebbel is not restricted to Germany. Ibsen, in the early days of German enthusiasm for his work, once expressed his surprise to a German critic that he should be hailed as an innovator and pioneer in a land that possessed a dramatic poet of the originality of Hebbel. How far Ibsen was himself influenced by his German predecessor we will not here attempt to estimate; but it is clear that his later social dramas belong to the same trend of ideas in dramatic literature as the series of Hebbel's tragedies from *Judith* to *Herodes* and *Gyges*. The central thesis of Ibsen's most characteristic works, the rights of the individual—we think especially of dramas like *A Doll's House*, *The Lady from the Sea*, *John Gabriel Borkman*—are analogous to those of Hebbel's tragedies. Even writers amongst the Latin peoples have succumbed to the influence of this great dialectician of the drama; D'Annunzio in Italy has turned to him as to a congenial spirit; and Maeterlinck —the Maeterlinck of *Pelléas et Mélisande* and *Monna Vanna*—is undoubtedly indebted to him.

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

NOTES ON 'SIR GAWAYNE AND THE GREEN KNIGHT.'

THE following notes are offered upon four passages in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight.*

(1) l. 681:

> Hadet wyth an aluisch mon, for angardeȝ pryde.

Cf. *Winnere and Wastour*, 267:

> In outtrage, in vnthrift, in angarte pryde:

and *Destruction of Troy*, 9745:

> If vs auntrid, Vlixes, thurgh angard of pride...

Angardeȝ is apparently the genitive singular of a sb. *angard(e)* = 'arrogance.' The etymology is uncertain, and there appears to be confusion with other words in some of the passages where *angard*, or one of its allied forms, occurs: these are especially frequent in the northern half of England, and notably in alliterative verse.

(i) The *N.E.D.* says: 'It looks like a perversion of O.N. *ágjarn*, ambitious, insolent, *ágirnd*, ambition, insolence; cf. also Mod. Icel. *gort*, brag, vainglorious boast, not in O.N. and of unknown origin.'

May we connect *gort* and *-gart* in such forms as *ouergart*, below? Perhaps the M.E. forms with *aug-*, *awg-*, may be more particularly related to *ágjarn*, etc.

(ii) I suggest that the form *angard(e)* came originally from the O.F. *ang(u)arde* < Late Latin *antegard(i)a*: and *anz-* / *einz-* *garde* < **antius-garda.*

Ducange, s.v. *Antegarda*, and *-ia*, says: 'Prima acies': and quotes from *Gesta Ludov. VII. Reg. Franc.* XII: 'Mos erat in exercitu, quod unus de magnis Baronibus faciebat quotidie Antegardam, et alius retrogardam, cum sufficiente numero militum': again, from a c. 1230 document, settling the controversy between the Counts Thibaut de

Champagne and Fernand of Flanders 'de Antegarda and Retrogarda in exercitu domini Regis faciendis' (*Tabularium Campaniae*, in Camera Comput., Paris: f. 279); cf. La Curne de Ste. Palaye, vol. I, s.v. *Angarde*: 'Avant-garde: Éminence, hauteur, donjon, tour, lieu élevé.' (It is used literally in the first sense in the *Chanson de Roland*.) The word was capable of metaphorical use in O.F. and A.F.; cf. *Anc. Poet. fr.* MSS. a. 1300: III, 970 (La C. de Ste. P.):

> Cuers de feme peut voler
> Quand il velt: si va et vient;
> Nule clés ne le ditient.
> Cuers est montis ens l'angarde,
> D'illoc porvoit et esgarde
> Par où cors puist eschaper.

There *angarde* = a watch-tower (metaph.): cf. Gower, *Mir. de l'Omme*, 16593 (ed. Macaulay):

> De quoy le cuer font enticer
> Au fol penser deinz son *einzgarde*

(explained by the editor as 'inner guard, stronghold').

Godefroy gives, s.v. *Angarde*: 'Hauteur, éminence, lieu d'observation; défense avancée sur une éminence à la différence de la bretèche qui était construite en rase campagne.' His examples also contain metaphorical applications. We have only to consider the modern metaphorical meaning of F. *hauteur*, to see that an extension of the meaning of *angarde* to 'pride' would be possible: other circumstances may have contributed to this meaning.

It seems possible, that, from the importance attached in the days of chivalry to the honour of being in, or leading, the vanguard, and from the pride or exultation of those so chosen, the word might have come to mean 'pride' and the like, either generally, or perhaps at first from a particular passage, in which the word was used in a transferred sense of the pride of the *avant-garde*, and was then slightly misunderstood.

Secondly, the frequent use of *angarde* in the sense of a tower, or eminence of some kind, would contribute to extend the metaphorical meaning from a watch-tower or elevation of the mind, to pride or exultation. It may be fanciful, but the idea recalls 'a falcon towering in her pride of place[1].'

(iii) In many M.E. passages there is apparently confusion with 'anger,' 'angered' (pp.), and so forth. Cf. *Destr. Troy*, 5113:

> And angert vs all angerdly sore.

[1] Cf. Godefroy s.v. *angarder* (vb.): 'servir d'avant-garde; guider, conduire': cf. 'L'étoile des mages anvardoit les trois roys ensi que ung chien qui anvarde son maistre.' (xv^e^ s. Valence, ap. la Fons. Gloss. MS. Bibl. Amiens.)

The adverb *angerdly* is the most frequent form in the *Destr. Tr.*, there being at least 42 instances of *angardly*, three of *angarely*, and two of *angurdly*: the other instances are of the verb or substantive.[1]

I imagine that there existed in E.M.E. two totally distinct words, *ouergart* and *angard*; of which the former was a compound of *ouer* and *gart*, perhaps the same as Mod. Icel. *gort* = 'pride'; and the latter derived as above. These were confused through scribal errors and likeness in meaning[2].

(iv) Cf. Björkman, *Scandinavian Loan-Words*, 34 and n., and 227 s.v. *ange* (*Orrm.* 11904, etc.) = 'trouble, affliction, anguish' (w. O.N. *-art* of neut. adj. or adv.; or O.F. *-ard*)?

(v) Other important forms of *angard*, or of words confused with it, are (cf. *N.E.D.*):

Metr. Hom., l. 49: '*Ongart* and rosing to forsake.'

Cursor M., l. 478: Cott. MS. *ouengart*, F. *awgart*, G. and Tr. *pride*; l. 7318: Cott. *ougard*, F. *awgarde*, G. and Tr. *enuy*. The *aw*-forms of F. may be compared to the O.F. *augarde* recorded by Ste. Palaye from *Lanc. du Lac*, II, 23vo; they may all have arisen from the frequent scribal confusion between *u* and *n*. The *ougard* of Cott. 7318 may easily be a contamination of *awgard* (*-u-*) and *ou(er)gart* (*-en-*), *o'ergart*, as also may *ongart* be of the latter and *angard*.

(2) ll. 966 f.

Hir body watȝ schort & þik,
Hir buttokeȝ bay & brode.

The word *bay* here is of doubtful meaning and origin. Professor Napier has observed that it cannot be from O.E. *būgan*, as Morris said: and that in M.E. *bay* usually means 'bay-coloured.' Can there be any connection with

(*a*) *bay* as in 'bay-window' (a word recorded by the *N.E.D.* as occurring in 1428)? The meaning would then be (1) 'jutting out,' (2) 'rounded.'

[1] Cf. ll. 5113, 6401—2, 6861, 6874, 6998, 7105—6, 7215, 7314, 7441, 7466, 7476, 7502, 7682, 7742, 7748, 7760—1, 7766, 7774, 7796, 7994, 8198, 8261, 8342, 8472, 8565, 8672, 9745, 10063, 10145, 10201, 10537—8, 10692—5, 10723, 10760, 11046, 11332, 11385, 11471, 11571, 11831, 12003, 12036, 12042, 12171, 12264, 13060, 13066, 13260.

[2] Other references are as follows: *Wars Alex.* (Sk., E.E.T.S.), 717 Ashm. and Dubl. and 772 A., D. (perhaps also *832 Dubl. and 733 A. and D.); *Orrmulum*, 8163 and 15770 (sb. *ouergart*); *St Marherete*, 1611 (sb. *ouergart*); *Poems Edw. II*, 391, *Pol. Songs* (Camden) 341 (adj. *overgart*); *Castle of Love*, 993 'ouergart proud' (adv.); *Will. of Palerne*, 1069, MS. 'ouer gart gret ost' (cf. M.'s n.); *Rel. Antiq.* ii, 226, 'overgord agast'; (as an adv. here, and in *Destruction of Troy*, it seems to mean little more than 'excessively, very'); *Sc. Leg. St.* xxx (Theodera) 215: 'Na ogart na pryd'; so also XL (Ninian) 1334, and Henry, *Wallace*, x, 155. Cf. EDD. s.vv. *Ogersfull* adj. and *Ugersfow* (cxviii).

(*b*) O.F. *baée, baie, beée* < Lat. **badāta* = 'gaping, open': cf. frequent O.F. phrase *gueule baie* (or *beé*) = 'open mouth(-ed).'

(*c*) F. *baie* < Lat. (Isidore) *baia*; cf. *N.E.D.* s.v. (2), 'rounded projection of the land into the sea.'

(3) ll. 1439 f.

> On þe sellokest swyn̄ swenged out þere,
> Long sythen [woned] fro þe sounder þat wiȝt for-olde.

MS. Long sythen for þe sounder, etc. Morris by conjecture read 'woned,' and 'severed' is suggested in the notes of the 1897 edition.

We probably need an *s*-word, for the sake of alliteration. *Severed* makes perfectly good sense; but perhaps it would be better to suppose the loss of a more technical sporting term. I propose *syng[u]ler*, or *sengler*[1], i.e. 'solitary,' 'separate': cp. O.F. *sengler*, F. *sanglier*: cf. the passage quoted by Morris from the *Boke of St Alban's*:

> From the sounder of the swyne thenne departyth he;
> A *synguler* is he soo, for alone he woll go.

See also *N.E.D.* s.vv. *Sanglier* and *Singular*, and *Morte A.* 3124: 'a bare synglere.'

Our author seems always to prefer the technical terms of hunting to less precise words.

(4) ll. 1729—32:

> & ȝe he lad hem, bi-lag[gid] mon, þe lorde & his meyny,
> On þis maner bi þe mountes, quyle myd, ouer, vnder,
> Whyle þe hende knyȝt at home holsumly slepeȝ,
> With-inne þe comly cortynes, on þe colde morne...

The punctuation in l. 1730 makes the line almost unintelligible, and any translation forced: as it stands, we must insert 'quyle' with 'ouer' and 'vnder,' and translate: 'now in the midst, now over (= up), now under (= down)': and suppose that 'quyle' was left out *metri gratia* (!) before the second and third terms. ('Quyle' could hardly be correlative with 'Whyle' in 1731, and not to be translated into N.E.)

I propose to read, in 1730:

> ...quyle myd ouer vnder

i.e. 'till midoverundern,' i.e. about 10.30 a.m., if we suppose 'undern' here to have its usual and earlier meaning of 9 a.m. (or, if 'under(n)' here means noon, 12 m., then about 1.30; but this is improbable in

[1] Or possibly *sengel* (=*single*), meaning 'separate.'

view of Gawayne's being still in bed, and of the early habits of the time).

The *N.E.D.* gives the following relevant passages, s.v. *Midoverundern*:

a. 1300. *E. E. Ps.* XXXVI, 6, He sal lede þi rihtwisnes als liht, And þi dome als midoverunder briht (Vulgate 'tamquam meridiem,' and one text of the above translation reads 'mid ouer-none,' while Wyclif has 'mydday': *Vesp. Ps.* 'on midne deg').

a. 1400—50. *Wars of Alexander* (Sk.), 3853, Þus raȝt he fra þis reuir be many ruȝe waies To it was meten to þe mere to myd-ouir-vndorne (Lat. 'circa horam vndecimam,' i.e. about 4.30 p.m.—5 p.m. Skeat takes the M.E. to mean about 10.30 a.m.). See also *Midouernoon* in *N.E.D.*

I think there is no doubt that we should read 'myd ouer vnder' (I have not yet been able to see the MS., but I suppose that the words are written separately, from Morris's punctuation): what precise time is meant is doubtful, since we may suppose that as the time of 'undern' varied, so would that of 'midoverundern.'

For 'quyle' in the sense proposed see l. 936.

CYRIL BRETT.

CARDIFF.

FIELDING'S 'CHAMPION' AND CAPTAIN HERCULES VINEGAR.

LITTLE attention seems to have been given to Captain Hercules Vinegar of Hockley in the Hole, the pseudo-editor of the *Champion*, to which Henry Fielding is known to have contributed for several years. The following will show that Vinegar was not a fictitious personage created for the occasion, but was an actual man who had received considerable advertisement as a prize-ring 'champion' in and about London.

The first *Champion*[1], that of November 15, 1739, begins thus: 'It is sufficiently known[2] that some Years since, to the great Terror of the small Vulgar, I entered upon the Title of *Captain*; this I did without the Consent of any one Person living, or without any other Commission or Authority than what I immediately derived from myself. I have now determin'd to lay aside the Sword, which, without Vanity, I may boast to have us'd with some Success, (though few Captains now living, can say the like) and take up the Pen in its Stead, with a Design to do as much Execution with the one, as I have already done with the other; or, in other Words, to tickle now, as I before bruised Men into good Manners.'

[1] It is an odd coincidence that just before (November 15, 1739) the first issue of the *Champion* appeared, all London was wrought up by a contest for the election of a Lord Mayor, in which Sir George Champion was one of the candidates. The matter came to a vote on September 29, 1739, and Champion was defeated. See *Gentleman's Magazine*, September, 1739, pp. 494—5, October, pp. 548—51, November, pp. 594—5; *London Magazine*, September, 1739, p. 465, October, pp. 499—505. Pamphlets in the contest were issued, as is shown by the Register of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, October, 1739, items 4, 6, 7, 8, 9; and the *London Magazine* booklist for October, p. 450, items 24 and 25.

[2] The first issue of the *Champion* was advertised in the *Daily Post* and the *London Daily Post* of November 12 and 13, 1739: 'On Thursday next will be publish'd for the first Time, | (To be continued every Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday | Morning) | THE CHAMPION; or, BRITISH MERCURY. | By the celebrated Capt. HERCULES VINEGAR, of | Hockley in the Hole. | Containing Essays on various Subjects, and the | freshest Advices, both Foreign and Domestick. | —Quod optanti Divum promittere nemo | Auderet Volvenda dies en attulit. Virg. | Printed for T. Cooper at the Globe in Pater-noster-Row.' The advertisements in both papers of November 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, put the same stress on the 'celebrated Capt. HERCULES VINEGAR, of Hockley in the Hole.'

In the paper of November 17, 1739, Vinegar declares: 'As for myself, I am so far from desiring to derive any Honour from my Ancestors, that I have retired to so obscure a Place as *Hockley in the Hole*, where my humble Habitation often reminds me, that *Hercules* himself was no more than a Descendant of *Adam*.'

In the paper of December 4, 1739, among other complaints Vinegar's 'Bookseller, *A. Moore*, of —— *near St. Paul's*' 'humbly hopes to be pardon'd when he represents to your Mightiness that some dislike the word *Champion*, some *Hercules Vinegar*, and some *Hockley in the Hole*....'

In the paper of December 4, Paul Serious objects: 'But why *Champion* and *Vinegar*, and Stuff? If you will not acquaint us with your own Name, why not subscribe *Alg. Sidney*, or *Osborne*, or *Walsingham*[1], or some other grave Man's which might avoid the least Appearance of a Jest.' In reply to these letters Vinegar declares on December 4: 'I am a Person of more Consequence than I appear to be, and may have dated these Papers from *Hockley in the Hole*, as a Propitiation to that beautiful Goddess of Envy, whom I have beforementioned...that the Humbleness of my Situation might lessen the Malevolence which might attend my Abilities; nay, perhaps, I may have deeper Reasons still, which, as I shall not yet discover, it will be in vain for any one, who can't cast a Figure, to trouble his Head about.'

Going farther, Fielding decided to sever connection with Hockley. In the paper of December 11 is a letter from Vinegar which, without any direct statement of the fact that it implies, is headed: '*From my Dining Room in* Pall-Mall, Dec. 10*th, being the first Night of my Arrival from* Hockley in the Hole.' A letter to the authors of the *Gazetteer* in the issue of December 25 says: 'Since I had left *Hockley in the Hole*, and you in full Possession of the *Bear Garden* there, I did not expect to have heard any more of you.'

The *Index to the Times* of December 13 (the only Index bearing either of Fielding's signatures) opens: 'As the Play-House, since some ingenious, young Gentlemen have turned it into a *Bear Garden*, falls naturally within my Province, I shall think proper to animadvert on such Occurrences there, as occasionally happen:....'

On January 10, 1740, in a letter attacking Vinegar but really aimed at Walpole (a fact confirmed by the note at the end signed ∗∗, i.e. Ralph) Fielding writes: 'Who are you? that have set yourself up for a Dictator in this Manner? That you come from *Hockley in the Hole* must be

[1] The *noms de guerre* of well-known political writers of the day.

confest, and do you think your creeping nearer the Court will alter the Manners of *Hockley*, into those of St. *James*'s; when it is notorious, that none but your old *Hockleyan* Acquaintance resort to you, Fellows who were never seen in a polite Part of the Town 'till your Arrival there?'

In the paper of January 15 on Authority, Fielding remarks that often 'we owe Esteem and Contempt, to accidental, indirect, and sometimes ridiculous Circumstances; of which I shall give this flagrant Instance, that 'till my Removal to a polite Part of the Town, the World paid very little Respect to those excellent Discourses with which I obliged them, possessing themselves with an Opinion, that nothing worth their reading, could possibly come from *Hockley in the Hole*.'

In the paper of January 26 Vinegar is addressed: 'You have lately surpriz'd the World by two very elaborate, (not to say dull) Essays upon Virtue. Who would have expected, or who indeed can bear such pious and moral Declamations from the Mouth of Capt. *Vinegar*?

Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes.

It would have been much more consonant with your former Character, to have taken the other Side, and have given a final Kick to this Lady....'

From this date, with exception of passages in the papers of March 25 and April 1 quoted below, nothing more is said of Hockley. With exception of what is in these two passages, Captain Vinegar might be any reformer of contemporary conditions, and might dwell anywhere. Indeed, the fiction of the Vinegar family is not well sustained in the *Champion*; and that of the Captain is practically lost, the papers being written as a rule without regard to his individuality. The papers that I have quoted are all signed C or L (Fielding's signature), except those of November 15 and 17 which I show in an article to appear in *Englische Studien* to be probably by Fielding. It seems that Fielding alone of the writers in the *Champion* from the beginning up to June 19, 1740, made any pretence of keeping up the Vinegar idea beyond so far as to address Hercules Vinegar as editor[1]. That in the papers of March 25 and April 1 Fielding again took up the notion and dealt with it more definitely than at any time before, may be accounted for by the facts that (as he declares on June 12) the *Champion* was now in good standing, and that it need not fear the ill effects that it seems to have suffered through association with Hockley and a former superintendent or champion there.

[1] An odd slip occurs in a note in the paper of January 5 following the essay signed C (Fielding). The note is addressed to 'Mr. Champion' and is signed 'Hercules Vinegar'!

On March 25 a letter protesting against the themes of the *Champion* articles concludes: 'Prithee, don't puzzle us with a Parcel of damned Wit and Morality, but let us now and then hear a Word or two from the Amphitheatres, where I should be very glad to meet you when there is a good Battle; you will, likewise, be welcome at my House any Morning you please, and, if you have not quite forsaken your old Exercises, I will take a Bout or two with you at Broad-sword and Quarter-staff, to convince you how much I am, *Dear* HERCULES, *Thine Sincerely*, TOM TOWNLY.' Though this paper is not signed, in *Englische Studien* I shall show it to be probably Fielding's.

The paper of April 1, signed C, is a letter from *Vander Bruin*, who is concerned about the amusements of England, and declares that the theatres are not worthy of discussion by persons of worth and that Vinegar has 'for this Reason entirely relinquished the Theatres to the most inimitable *Laureat*.' 'But tho' this should be the Case with the Dramatic World, yet, methinks, those gymnastic Encounters, those ruder Exercises which so particularly distinguish the martial Genius of this Kingdom, the Care of which formerly belonged to you, should still engage your Attention, and come under your Notice; for, tho' you have changed your Lodging [i.e. from Hockley to Pall Mall], I presume you still frequent the Arena at *Tottenham*, and your once celebrated Retirement at *Hockley in the Hole*, where I do not doubt but proper Deference is yet paid to you by the Combatants....' The writer points his appeal by stating that he is 'at length reduced to get [his] Livelihood by a Shew,' and continues: 'In short, Sir, I have at present by me two very fine He-Bears, both *Brothers* of the same Litter, which I shall shortly have baited at your Theatre-Royal, otherwise called His Majesty's Bear-Garden in *Hockley in the Hole*.' He says later: 'Besides the Expectation of an advanced Price, I have another Reason for removing to the Bear-Garden, which your Predecessors and your self have brought under such good Order and Regulation;....' His bears have not been fairly treated by the spectators. 'This is a Behaviour, which I am sure all such true Lovers of Sport and Encouragers of fair Play as yourself must detest,....[1]'

[1] This letter from *Vander Bruin* concerning the *Brother Bears* is really a veiled political attack. The Great Bear is Robert Walpole. See the following passages in the 1741 and 1743 reprinted *Champion* where the idea is continued: II. 87, par. 1; 96, par. 1; 196, par. 4; 204—5.—The opening of the letter refers to the periodicals *Common-Sense* and the *Craftsman*. In *Common-Sense*, Nov. 12, 1737, is a letter from *Van Bruin*, who as a comic dramatist has been ruined by the Licensing Act, protesting against the Act that caused Fielding's retirement from dramatic writing, and commending (with satirical suggestion) his Siberian Bear. This Bear satire occurs again in *Common-Sense*, Sept. 23, 1738, in an attack on

From all this it appears that to Fielding Captain Hercules Vinegar was a well-known retired prize-ring champion who had formerly exhibited at Hockley in the Hole and in the Arena at Tottenham[1], and had been a sort of director of great efficiency at His Majesty's Bear-Garden[2]. That Captain Vinegar's former association with such a profession was not necessarily so largely detrimental to his high personal excellence and standing in the community as we to-day would suppose, is shown by the esteem in which John Broughton was held from the date of his defeat (1750) until he died in 1789 worth £7000. Further, it should be borne in mind that prize-fighters in the eighteenth century contended with the cudgel, the sword, and the quarter-staff as well as with the fists, one bout often succeeding the other—as witness the exploits of the great Figg[3]. Often the prize-fighter and also the official now styled 'referee,' were in the eighteenth century styled 'Captain' or 'The Captain[4].'

'Captain Hercules Vinegar' was the pseudonym of a prize-ring 'champion' of considerable notoriety at least in and about the year 1731.

In his *Pugilistica*[5] (I. 10—11) Henry Downes Miles notes: 'Besides this nobly patronised amphitheatre of Fig, there were several booths, and rings strongly supported. That in Smithfield, we have it upon good authority, was presided over by one "Mr. Andrew Johnson," asserted to be an uncle of the great lexicographer. There was also that in Moorfields, called at times "the booth," at others "the ring." The "ring" was kept by an eccentric character known as "Old Vinegar," the "booth" by Rimmington, whose sobriquet was "Long Charles"....' Boulton in his *Amusements of Old London* (II. 74) remarks: 'Besides Mr. Figg's establishment there were others conducted on quite similar lines, though with less success, at Smithfield, Moorfields and St. George's Fields. A Mr. Andrew Johnson, who was

Walpole under guise of a record of a manuscript in prose and verse that purports to be an ancient assault on Robert Dudley.

[1] Probably the Great Booth of George Taylor in Tottenham Court Road, whose great ornament at this time was the incomparable John Broughton.

[2] '...near Clerkenwell Green' in Ray Street, formerly Hockley in the Hole. Pinks, *History of Clerkenwell*, 2nd edit., London, 1881, pp. 157—8. –Hockley was celebrated for its bear-baiting and prize-fights, and had a very unsavoury reputation. Pinks, Index, s.v., Hockley-in-the-Hole; Boulton, *Amusements of Old London*, II. 79 ff.; Thornbury's *London*, II. (see Index).

[3] *E.g.*, see Boulton, *op. cit.* II. 70, where is quoted an advertisement of 'a grand parade by the valiant Figg, who will exhibit his knowledge in various combats with the foil, back-sword, cudgel, and fist.'

[4] Fred Henning, *Fights for the Championship*, London, reprinted from the *Victuallers' Gazette*, I. 46.

[5] *Pugilistica: Being One Hundred and Forty-Four Years of the History of British Boxing.* London, Weldon & Co., 9, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

said to be an uncle of the great Doctor, presided at Smithfield; a man nicknamed "Old Vinegar" at Moorfields; and a gentleman named Remington, called Long Charles by his clients, was the patron of another establishment known as the Ring.' Apparently Boulton got this matter from Miles' work. I have not succeeded in tracing Miles' original. The copies of Captain John Godfrey's book[1] in the British Museum I have had carefully searched without eliciting material concerning Vinegar.

The following advertisements (with one exception noted below not yet reprinted, I believe) show something of Vinegar's activity in 1731.

The *Daily Post*, March 16 and 17, 1731, announces for the 17th 'At Mr. Figg's[2] Great-Room At his House the Sign of the City of Oxford, in Oxford Road' a battle between Andrew Mac-Colley and John Wells. The notice concludes 'N.B. The Boxes will be set at Two and the Champions mount at Four precisely. There will also be good Diversion with Capt. Vinegar's Company, by way of Introduction to a good Summer's Proceedings.'

The *Daily Post*, March 27, 29, 30, 31, announces for the 31st at 'Mr. Figg's Great Room' a contest between William Sherlock and Edward Sutton. The notice ends: 'Capt. Vinegar will entertain the Company with his usual Diversion of Cudgel-playing.'

The *Daily Journal* of March 30 gives notice of Bear-fighting, etc. 'At Mr. Stokes's Amphiteatre,' that ends: 'N.B. There will also be good Diversion of Cudgel-playing, &c. Captain Vinegar being just crept out of his Bottle, where he has been stopt up all Winter, and looking plaguy Sower and Mothery.'

[1] *A Treatise upon the Useful Art of Self Defense*, London, 1740. A later edition appeared 1747.

[2] Figg's School is mentioned with praise in Fielding's signed paper of January 29, 1740, as a place where one 'will meet with the best and properest Company.'—Imitative of the style of the advertisements of sporting events such as Vinegar and Figg were interested in, are the notices in the *Champion's* 'Index to the Times' of April 19, 1740.

In the 'Index to the Times' of the *Champion* of March 4, 1740 (in which, by the way, Jonathan Wyld is by name referred to by Fielding) is an elaborate puff of Captain Miller's 'Book of the Ancient and noble Science of the Sword' just 'on the *Point* of issuing from the Press.' The puff hits at the war with Spain, and is a letter signed by 'TIM. BUCK, *junior*.' The Captain Miller here referred to was probably the James Miller whom Steele saw contend at the Bear-Garden in Hockley-in-the-Hole in 1712 (see *Spectator*, No. 436; Pinks, *op. cit.* pp. 160 ff.; Boulton, *op. cit.* I. 19 ff.; Castle, *Schools and Masters of Fence*, pp. 204—5). Miller's opponent and conqueror in that contest was Timothy Buck of Clare-market, apparently the 'senior' of the supposed writer of the puff-letter. Miller's book is listed by Egerton Castle (*Schools and Masters of Fence*, London, 1885, p. xlviii; *Fencing, Boxing, Wrestling*, Badminton Library, London, 1893, Bibliography) as published 1738: 'A Treatise on fencing by Captain J. Miller, in the shape of an album of fifteen copper-plates engraved by Scotin, with one column of text.' If Castle is right, the publication announced in the *Champion* would appear to be a reprint. Miller fought for the Government in 1745 and legitimately obtained the title 'Captain.'

The *Daily Journal* of April 20 announces for the 21st 'At Mr. Figg's Great-Room' a contest between Rowland Bennet and Edward Sutton. This statement is made: 'Note, It will be a general Field-Day, with Capt. Vinegar, and his Forces, who will pass tho [*sic*] an extraordinary Exercise on this Occasion, and give uncommon Satisfaction.'

The *Daily Journal* for April 27 announces for the 28th at Figg's another contest between Bennet and Sutton. The notice ends: 'Captain Vinegar will attend as usual, and entertain the Company with some new Improvements of the Leather Bottle, having lately discover'd a far more easy and concise Way of breaking Loggerheads than formerly &c.' This same matter (except '&c.') appears in the *Daily Post* of April 28.

The *Daily Journal* of May 4 and the *Daily Post* of May 5 announce for the 5th at Figg's a contest between Michael Buttler and Edward Sutton. The notice ends: 'Note, Attendance will be given at Three, and the Masters mount at Six precisely. And as great Quarrels have arose amongst the Gentlemen of the Sword, concerning Mr. Mac Guire's Nose[1], as well as Mr. Sutton's, Capt. Vinegar and his Company, are to fight at Blunts for both: So that there will be good Diversion.'

The *Daily Post* of May 10 announces for Wednesday the 12th at Figg's a battle between William Gill and Felix Macguire. The notice ends: 'There will be the usual Diversion before the Masters mount by Captain Vinegar's Company.'

The *Daily Post* of May 17 and 19 announce for the 19th at Figg's a battle between Felix Macguire and Edward Sutton. The notice ends: 'Note, A general Court Martial will be held to divert Company before the Masters mount, by Captain Vinegar and other Field Officers, for the Trial of some new-listed Recruits and old Offenders, on Neglect of Duty, and for disobeying Orders on Wednesday last.'

The *Daily Post* of May 24th announces for that date at 'Mr. Stokes's Amphitheatre in Islington Road' a battle between Thomas Terriwest and Thomas Sibliss. The notice concludes: 'And for the Diversion of the Spectators, before they [the Masters] mount, Capt. Vinegar will present them with a new Tragi-comi-pastoral Farce of one Act, call'd, Flesh no Fence against a Flail; or, The Art of beating Linnen on the Skin: Wherein several Loggerheads will go near to be broken, and the Best come off with dry Blows.' The same matter is in the notice in the *Daily Journal* of the same date. A part of this paragraph about

[1] The *Gentleman's Magazine* 'Monthly Intelligencer' for April, 1731, page 172, reads: 'Wednesday, April 14. Mr *Macguire*, a Prize-fighter, had his Noise [*sic*] cut clear from his Face by Mr *Sutton*, at Mr *Figg's* Amphitheatre.'

Vinegar is printed in Pinks, *History of Clerkenwell*, edit. 2, London, 1881, p. 487.

These seem to be all the notices of Vinegar to be obtained from the *Daily Post*, the *Daily Journal*, and the *Daily Courier*, from January 1 to September 1, 1731[1]. I have had the *Daily Post* and *London Daily Post* from January to November 1739[2] inclusive searched in vain for notices of Vinegar[3].

The use of Vinegar as editor of the *Champion* is of some little importance. Certainly in view of the humorous treatment of Vinegar in the advertisements, Paul Serious, the *Champion's* correspondent of December 4, 1739, had reason to protest ironically (see above): 'If you will not acquaint us with your own Name, why not subscribe *Alg. Sidney*, or *Osborne*, or *Walsingham*, or some other grave Man's which might avoid the least Appearance of a Jest.' In 1737 Fielding gave up the regular composition of farces and satirical plays. Yet in November, 1739, by his[4] very choice of title and editor for the *Champion*, he gave to the periodical at the outset a farcical colour of which he himself a number of times reminded his readers in the passages that I have quoted. The situation is odd in face of the fact that many of Fielding's own papers in the *Champion* were evidently written very seriously and were intended to be taken seriously. As I have said, Fielding's collaborators in November 1730—June 1740 did not deal with the Vinegar fiction.

John Edwin Wells.

Beloit, Wisconsin, U.S.A.

[1] The following issues seem to be missing in the British Museum: *Daily Post*, Jan. 1; Apr. 30; Aug. 17;—*Daily Courier*, the whole of April.

[2] The following issues seem not to be in the British Museum: *Daily Post*, Jan. 15; Mar. 10, 12; May 1—7; July 30; Aug. 28; Sept. 10; Oct. 1, 3, 16, 17, 24, 27; Nov. 23, 24;—*London Daily Post*, Jan. 15; Mar. 10; May 1—7; July 30; Sept. 10; Oct. 1, 17; Nov. 23, 24.

[3] In *Notes and Queries*, 1883, Sixth Series, Vol. VII. pages 406—7, Mr Austin Dobson inquired concerning a pamphlet ascribed to Vinegar. In the New York *Nation* of January 16, 1913, pp. 53—4, I discuss this pamphlet, which was advertised in the *Grub Street Journal* of July 29, 1731; and which was noticed as follows in the *Daily Post* of July 24, 1731: 'This Day is publish'd, An Answer to one Part of a late infamous LIBEL, reflecting on Captain Vinegar and the late worthy Jonathan Wilde. In a Letter to Mr. James F–gg, the supposed Author thereof. In which Letter the Character and Conduct of the Gentleman, alias Captain Hercules Vinegar, are fully vindicated. By Hercules Vinegar of Hockley in the Hole, Esq.; Sold by A. Dodd at the Peacock without Temple-Bar. Pr. 6d.'

It is of interest to note that in Chapter II of *Jonathan Wild* the 1743 editions state of the hero's father: '*Jonathan* married *Elizabeth*, daughter of *Ralph Hollow*, esq.' In the 1754 edition Fielding altered this to read: 'daughter of *Scragg Hollow*, of *Hockley-in-the-Hole*, Esq.'

Well known is the use of Vinegar's name as pseudonym by the authors of the 1742 attacks on Pope, *The Cudgel; or a Crab-tree Lecture*, and *Blast upon Blast, and Lick for Lick*.

[4] In my article on the *Champion*, to appear in *Englische Studien*, I show that Fielding wrote, or had a chief part in writing, the first four papers of the *Champion*, issues not hitherto claimed for him.

VICTOR HUGO'S USE OF 'LES DÉLICES DE LA GRANDE BRETAGNE' IN 'L'HOMME QUI RIT.'

With the *Homme qui rit* Victor Hugo intended to begin a set of social studies. 'Le vrai titre de ce livre serait l'Aristocratie,' he writes in his preface to the book, and in a letter to his publisher Lacroix, dated December, 1868, in which he objects to having his work called a historical novel, he says: 'Par ordre du roi (this was originally to have been the title of the book) sera donc l'Angleterre vraie, peinte par des personnages inventés. L'intérêt ne sera que sur des personnages résultant du milieu historique ou aristocratique d'alors, mais créés par l'auteur.' Victor Hugo deceives himself—or does he merely wish to deceive us?—in thinking that the interest lies in the characters; the characters are not the result of their milieu, aristocratic or otherwise; neither Ursus nor Gwynplaine is representative of the ordinary travelling mountebank; Ursus indulges more in philosophical reflections than in conjuring tricks, and in the Laughing Man, it is hard to trace either the consequences of his aristocratic birth or of his democratic breeding. So shadowy, so undeveloped is his character, that we are quite unprepared for his socialistic outburst in the House of Lords, when for the first time he takes his place among his peers. Yet if Victor Hugo has not succeeded in creating characters essentially typical of social classes in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, if he has not depicted the social England of that day by showing us Lord David Dirry-Moir playing the part of Tom-Jim-Jack, or Gwynplaine the mountebank haranguing the House of Lords, he has found for himself a suitable reason for depicting the social state of England in introducing us to those characters. Surely it is permissible to talk of court-life and club-life when we are in the society of Lord David, and what could be more natural than to find ourselves among the common people watching a boxing match at Lambeth or the performance of the Laughing Man at Tadcaster Inn, when we have as our guide Tom-Jim-Jack? Or

again, there is an opportunity not to be lost of making us acquainted with the old Westminster Hall, with the old House of Commons and House of Lords, with the Chancellor on his woolsack and the sergeant of the Black Rod in his official robes, with the relationship that existed between the Upper and Lower House, and all the barriers that stood between them, when Gwynplaine is invested with his robes as a peer of the realm, and is ceremoniously led to the House where he is to take his place as Lord Fermain Clancharlie.

Thus does Victor Hugo describe, whether accurately or otherwise, English society, the common people and the aristocracy. He trusts largely to those descriptions for gaining the end he has in view; but at the same time he knows what valuable service his characters, even if they are not produced by their milieu, can render him, if he but make of them his *porte-voix*. Hugo can rarely be without someone who soliloquizes. It is the Hugo of the *Misérables* who speaks in Ursus. And yet Ursus cleverly tries to give to his ideas the colour of the seventeenth century rather than that of 1860, by drawing his comparisons from occurrences that might have struck the mind of one of his time. 'La langue de l'ours,' he says, 'est l'ébauchoir de Dieu. Et dire que si je n'avais pas été depuis trente ans grugé par des espèces de cette sorte, je serais riche,...je serais du Collège des Docteurs, et j'aurais le droit d'user de la bibliothèque bâtie en 1652 par le célèbre Harvey, et d'aller travailler dans la lanterne du dôme d'où l'on découvre toute la ville de Londres.' Such comparisons and allusions abound, and might be called 'historical colour.'

But besides the actual descriptions of actual places, the philosophical reflections and reasonings tinged with historical colour, and the introduction of passages which are purely historical, Victor Hugo introduces into his work many names, facts, stories, legends even, in order to create the framework he requires, to enhance the value of his social ideas, and to give to the whole colour, local rather than historical. It is of the local colour which Hugo borrowed from Beeverell that we mean to speak in detail.

Victor Hugo in preparing his 'dossier' for *L'Homme qui rit* had recourse to various books on England, in the latter half of the seventeenth and at the beginning of the eighteenth century, books which were either written in French, or translated into French. English books were of little use to Hugo, as his knowledge of the English language was in 1864 of the slightest. One of the books which Hugo constantly used, read and reread with a view to getting to know

England was the *Délices de la Grande Bretagne* by James Beeverell, published in Leyden in 1707. The *Délices* is quite a considerable work of eight volumes, which describes Scotland, England and Ireland, county by county, topographically and historically, with remarks on the inhabitants, on their ways and customs, on their religion and on their speech. In this volume Hugo found much useful material.

The society which Hugo portrays and studies is English society; at the same time, he does not leave Scotland and Ireland out of account. From Hugo's point of view, it would be waste of good material to do so, seeing the good material was to be found in Beeverell's *Délices*. Only thirty years ago, too, Hugo had been the young leader of the Romantic school, and had felt the charm of Ossianic poetry, and the mystery that hung over unknown lands, one of which was far away Scotland. No one knew better than Hugo the power of a word, a name, power at once suggestive and creative. The scene of action is England, but by the power of a word, the imagination wanders far back into the misty ages of the past, into lands that are legendary and yet a reality. Thus the book gains in breadth—its bounds, so to speak, are infinitely extended; and all this by the suggestive power of a word.

The hero must not be an ordinary Englishman. All seventeenth century books agree as to the prosaic character of the Englishman. 'He is a lover of meat,' they say, and believe that in saying so, they sum up his character. These same books speak of the 'Écossois sauvages,' by which they mean 'Highlanders.' Something in the fierceness of these 'barbarians' struck Hugo's imagination. So the hero comes to be Lord David Dirry-Moir. But whence the name? Victor Hugo says, 'qu'il obtint la permission de s'appeler lord David Dirry-Moir, d'une seigneurie que sa mère, qui venait de mourir, lui avait léguée dans cette grande forêt d'Écosse où l'on trouve l'oiseau Krag, lequel creuse son nid avec son bec dans le tronc des chênes.' In the seventh volume of the *Délices*, we find the following: 'Le pays est entrecoupé de trois grandes forêts, l'une au Nord-Ouest, nommée Dirry-Moir.' Then follows a description of the birds and beasts to be found in the forest, which ends thus: 'Il s'y trouve entr'autres une espèce d'oiseau, particulière à ce pays-là d'une figure aprochante d'un perroquet. On le nomme Knag, c'est une sorte de pivert, qui se creuse son nid avec le bec dans le tronc des chênes.' On looking at the manuscript of *L'Homme qui rit*, it would be impossible to say whether Hugo actually wrote 'Knag' or 'Krag'; but in either case, there can be no doubt as to the source of his information.

The last chapter in the first book of the second part of *L'Homme qui rit* is entitled 'Écosse, Irlande et Angleterre.' A Scot and an Irishman are set to fight each other, and young England looks on. The Scot is called 'Helmsgail.' On the page of the *Délices* where we find the reference to the Dirry-Moir, we find: 'Les plus remarquables de ces rivières sont le Shin, le Brora et l'Ully qu'on appèle autrement Helmsdail,' which suggested the name of the Scottish boxer all the more probably, because the Irish boxer was 'de Tipperary nommé du nom de sa montagne natale Phelem-ghe-madone.' Beeverell says in the eighth volume of the *Délices*, 'Le comté (Tipperary) se termine par un rang de douze montagnes,...nommées Phelem-ghe-Madone.' Hugo does not hesitate to change the mountain range into the 'montagne natale' of the boxer. Helmsgail, we are told, had done great deeds in boxing with 'Six miles water'; 'Six miles water' is mentioned in the *Délices* as being a little river in Ireland.

In introducing us to the fight, Hugo says, 'Irlande et Écosse allaient se cogner; Érin allait donner des coups de poing à Gajothel.' By Gajothel Hugo evidently means Scotland, and yet when we read the *Délices*, we think he must have made a mistake. In the sixth volume of the *Délices*, Beeverell says, 'Et c'est peut-être à cause de cela que les Ecossois sauvages qui sont la vraye race des Scots anciens, s'apèlent en leur langage Gajothel, et Gaithel, et leur langue Gaithlac.' But this gives us no grounds for supposing that 'Gajothel' means Scotland as well as Scots.

The spectators greet the two combatants, 'Bravo Helmsgail! good! well done, highlander.' From the seventh volume of the *Délices*, we learn that 'les Ecossois civilisés apèlent ces gens là (i.e., les Ecossois barbares) Highlands-men ou "Highlanders."'

There is another instance of Hugo's giving geographical names to his characters. The 'comprachicos' were a band made up of people of all nations. 'Forces basques y dialoguaient avec force irlandais, le basque et l'irlandais se comprennent.' When the 'Matutina' is going down, the comprachicos on board, when all hope is gone, put their signatures to an account of the crime they had committed, believing that in some way their souls may be thus purged of their guilt. The second to sign was a Basque woman, and the third, unable to write, put her cross to it, and against the cross was written, 'Barbara Fermoy, de l'île Tyrryf, dans les Ebudes.' Barbara Fermoy is the Irishwoman on board; Fermoy is the name of a small village, a 'bourg' in Ireland (*Délices*, vol. VIII); but why does Hugo say 'de l'île Tyrryf, dans les

Ebudes'? 'Tyrryf...est la plus fertile de toutes les Ebudes,' says Beeverell, in describing the Scottish Hebrides. It does not seem likely that Hugo would consciously have chosen the Islands of Scotland to be the native place of the Irishwoman Barbara; it seems more probable that Hugo, opening the *Délices* at random, had his attention attracted by the following inscription in very large print, 'Tumulus Regum Hiberniae.' On the opposite page, on the corresponding line, we find the name 'Tyrryf'; Hugo doubtless noted it, as he noted the inscription, and the word 'Hiberniae' in large letters was sufficient to make him associate 'Tyrryf' with Ireland. This curious association of facts, based on insufficient observation, is not uncommon in the works of Hugo.

We have noticed how Hugo in describing the comprachicos has linked the Basques and the Irish, and how he thinks of them together in the scene of the shipwreck. He continues to do so till the end of the scene. The doctor, who is carrying out the confession, begins to repeat the Lord's Prayer in Latin. Hugo continues, 'L'Irlandaise reprit en langue galloise, comprise de la femme basque, "Ar nathair ata ar neamh."' And so the prayer continues in Latin, French and Irish till the ship goes under. In the eighth volume of the *Délices*, we have the following note on the Irish tongue: 'Une langue...qui a quelque rapport avec le Gallois, et une très grande affinité avec la langue des Ecossois Sauvages.' Then comes the Lord's Prayer in Irish, exactly as Victor Hugo quotes it, followed by the remark that the prayer was taken from an Irish Bible of the year 1690. What a power Hugo has of making use of material of all kind! With what effect does he use this Lord's Prayer! What colour it gives to his idea of the comprachicos!

In another place, Victor Hugo compares England and Ireland, for the sake of the atmosphere which for him surrounded things Irish. 'En cela,' he says, 'l'anglais diffère de l'irlandais qui prie les saints pour la santé du loup et l'appelle "mon parrain."' It is interesting to note that this remark is added to the original manuscript, and that in the manuscript *brouillon*, there is a note which leads us to think that Hugo changed his idea as to the wolf. 'Le loup est un protestant,' he writes in the *brouillon*. This, we presume, was written before he read the passage in the *Délices*, vol. VIII, which says: 'Ils (les Irlandais) ont une espèce de vénération pour les loups, ils les apèlent leurs parrains, prient Dieu pour leur santé, et s'imaginent par là qu'ils n'en recevront aucun mal.'

We can thus trace Victor Hugo's knowledge of Ireland, and

practically all his knowledge of Scotland, to the *Délices*. One Scottish allusion we have not been able to trace to the *Délices*—the allusion to the cry of the Counts of Buchan. We realise that, however much he may use unknown Ireland and barbarous Scotland to stir up the imagination, he himself in speaking did not draw on his imagination, but on what a seventeenth century writer considers to be fact, and relates as such with much *naïveté* and in all good faith.

In the case of England, it is more difficult to decide what is local colour and what is simply descriptive. Scotland and Ireland are clearly used only for the sake of atmosphere and colour; they have no real connection with the book—neither with the plot, nor with the social study. The description of England, on the contrary, is essential to the existence of the book. But in this description, there are parts which are not necessary in themselves, but which have appealed to Hugo as giving an added interest—often one which borders on the legendary—to what he describes, or as being typically representative of a bygone age. After the semi-failure of the *Homme qui rit*, Hugo partly blamed his publisher, but in part he blamed himself. 'Moi—j'ai voulu abuser du roman, j'ai voulu en faire une épopée,' he writes. And, indeed, in describing England of the early eighteenth century, he dwells with pleasure on details that speak of a more epic age; these details do not describe in themselves, but give colour to Hugo's description of places and events.

Thus, for instance, he uses Cornish tales of prowess in describing the boxing match. He must have men of strength to judge of strength and skill; better still, men who were famous in their day for deeds of strength. 'Dans le groupe pour Helmsgail on remarquait John Gromane, fameux pour porter un bœuf sur son dos, et un nommé John Bray qui un jour avait pris sur ses épaules dix boisseaux de farine à quinze gallons par boisseau, plus le meunier, et avait marché avec cette charge plus de cents pas loin. Du côté de Phelem-ghe-madone, lord Hyde avait amené de Launceston un certain Kilter, lequel demeurait au Château-Vert, et lançait par dessus son épaule une pierre de vingt livres, plus haut que la plus haute tour du château. Ces trois hommes, Kilter, Bray et Gromane étaient de Cornouailles, ce qui honore le comté.' This whole passage we find almost literally transcribed from the third volume of the *Délices*. 'Un nommé Jean Romane portait le corps tout entier d'un bœuf éventré; un certain Kilter, qui demeuroit au Château verd de Launceston, jetoit par dessus l'épaule une pierre de plusieurs livres, au delà de la plus haute

Tour du Château. Un nommé Jean Bray portoit sur ses épaules, plus de deux cens pas loins, six boisseaux de farine de froment, à quinze gallons pour boisseau (ce qui faisoit le poids de cinq cens quarante livres) et par dessus tout cela, le meunier agé d'environ vint-quatre ans.' The only detail Hugo thinks unworthy of mention is the age of the miller; and it in no wise troubles him that we have no means of knowing when those local Cornish heroes lived. Others whom Beeverell mentions in the same place lived in the reign of Elizabeth, but of these he tells us nothing further. We cannot say that these men, thus introduced into the account of the boxing match, give to it an air of greater historical verity, but they do their share in lending to the narrative additional colour.

This desire for colour explains the existence of certain chapters in *L'Homme qui rit*. The long descriptions of Chess Hill and Portland are for the greater part unnecessary either for the development of the characters, or for the carrying on of the intrigue. Nor do they help us in forming our idea of England or of the aristocracy. Hugo was tempted to write them partly by his love of description, wherever he can get strong effects, partly too by the material he had at his disposal. The *Délices* in talking of the Mont St Michel and of Cornwall dwells on the past, on animals and vegetation that have been and are no more. The wonder of the past cast its spell on Hugo, and defying every principle of the Realistic school as regards exactitude and truth in description, and shocking perhaps in us a certain feeling of literary honesty, he takes certain picturesque details, facts or otherwise, which Beeverell uses in his description of the Mont St Michel and Cornwall, and makes use of them to describe the isthmus of Portland. 'On cueille encore, l'été, dans ces terrains forés et troués comme l'éponge, du romarin, du pouliot, de l'hysope sauvage, du fenouil de mer, qui infusé, donne un bon cordial, et cette herbe, pleine de nœuds, qui sort du sable et dont on fait de la natte, mais on n'y ramasse plus ni ambre gris, ni étain noir, ni cette triple espèce d'ardoise, l'une verte, l'autre bleue, l'autre couleur de feuilles de sauge.' But it is perhaps unnecessary to quote more of *L'Homme qui rit*, and sufficient to quote the corresponding passages from the *Délices*. 'Entre diverses pierres qui se tirent des carriéres,' says Beeverell (vol. III), 'on y trouve de trois sortes d'ardoise, dont l'une est bleuâtre, l'autre couleur de feuilles de sauge, et la troisième verte....Il croit dans les campagnes sablonneuses une herbe pleine de nœuds, dont ils font de la natte. On y trouve aussi quantité de fenouil marin, dont la racine conservée en

syrop, est un cordial excellent. Les rochers qui sont sur le rivage de la mer, produisent de l'hysope sauvage, du pouliot, du romarin, et d'autres herbes odiferantes.' 'On rencontre quelquefois de l'ambre gris sur le rivage.' The changes made by Hugo are very slight; he says arbitrarily that the three coloured slate is a thing of the past; but this proceeding is probably suggested by comparisons between the past and the present which Beeverell goes on to make. We continue to quote the parts of the *Délices* which Hugo has adopted in his description of Portland. 'Les rochers fourmillent de marbres, de blereaux et de loutres; il s'y trouve aussi des renards, des chevreuils, et des chamois.' ('Il n'y en a plus,' says Hugo of the chamois.) 'On y a diverses espêces de poissons, comme des truites, des anguilles, des saumons, des plies, des pilchards et d'autres, peu connus ailleurs. Les saumons montent dans les rivières entre la S. Michel et la Noël pour y pondre leurs œufs.' (Again Hugo makes use of this as belonging to the past: 'Les saumons effarouchés ne remontent plus.') 'Sous le règne de la Reine Elizabeth, on vit venir en Cornouaille vers le temps de la moisson, de grandes volées d'oiseaux inconnus, plus gros que des éperviers. Ils avaient le bec si pointu qu'ils coupoient une pomme en deux, dont ils ne mangeoient que le pepin.' Here Hugo has no change to make. Those strange birds exist no more, but the Cornish Chough does (according to Beeverell) which Hugo relegates to the past. 'Ce rocher et toute la côte voisine est remplie d'une espêce de corbeaux à bec jaune, qu'on apèle en Anglois, Cornish Chough, en Latin Pyrrocorax, ils sont fort larrons, et fort dangereux, parce qu'ils prennent quelquefois des buchettes allumées, qu'ils jettent dans les maisons.' Beeverell makes no mention of the legendary bird-wizard—which Hugo added to his original manuscript—but the legendary animal 'aux pieds de porc et au cri de veau' which Hugo describes seems to be closely related to Beeverell's 'veaux marins qui ressemblent à des cochons, excepté qu'ils ont les pieds comme une taupe.' We find another detail evidently suggested by the *Délices* and reproduced in slightly altered form. 'Il s'y trouve des faucons et des bécasses,' says Beeverell, 'mais on n'y voit aucun rossignol. La raison de cela est, parcequ'il n'y a que très peu de bois.' Hugo contrasts the lack of nightingales with the presence of the other birds, but in the past only. Then we have a curious sentence, made up of details chosen from separate parts of the chapter. Hugo tells us of small hardy sheep with coarse wool, such as one would expect to find in a rather barren part of the country, the kind too one would

expect to find guarded by centenarians, shepherds whose chief food was garlic. In three different parts of the *Délices* do we find first: 'Leurs brebis avoient ci-devant le corps petit et la laine rude, parceque la terre etoit en friche'; then in speaking of the inhabitants of Cornwall: 'on attribue en partie la cause de la vigueur et de la santé qu'on leur voit, au grand usage qu'ils font de l'ail,' and where Beeverell speaks of Kilter, Romane and Bray, he says: 'une seule Paroisse vit mourir dans l'espace de quatorze semaines, quatre personnes, dont les années faisoient ensemble le nombre de trois cens quarante.' In the article on Meneg, mention is made of 'Godolphin, nom qui en la langue du pays signifie une aigle blanche.'

When Hugo first speaks of Portland, in the chapter called 'La Pointe nord de Portland,' he borrows local colour twice from Beeverell's chapter on Portland, in describing the inhabitants and their means of livelihood. Beeverell says (vol. III): 'Il n'y a point de bois, et les habitans y font leur feu avec de la fiente de bœuf séchée au Soleil. Ils ont été autrefois les plus habiles de tous les Anglois au maniement de la Fronde...on pêche le long des côtes, aux environs de la Presqu'Ile de Portland, une espêce d'arbrisseau sans feuille, qui ressemble au corail, nommé Plin en Anglois et Isidis plocamos en Grec et en Latin.' But what is curious to notice is that Hugo speaks of the religion of those inhabitants, of which there is no word in Beeverell's chapter on Portland; but on turning back three or four pages, our attention is attracted by the following in the article on Dorchester: à quelques milles au Nord de cette ville est le bourg de Cerne, où les anciens Saxons Payens adoroient une Idole nommée Heil. Le moine Augustin, qui les convertit, brisa cette Idole.' And so we understand the religion ascribed to the ancient inhabitants of Portland by Hugo; what is more difficult to fathom, is the psychological phenomenon by which Hugo takes a sentence descriptive of people in the seventeenth century, puts it alongside of another referring to centuries long gone by, and uses these to characterise the people at one given moment.

But it is not only of those odd little scraps of information that Hugo makes use; we have yet to see what use he made of pictures; how they appealed to him, how he studied them, and made them serve his purpose. The lighthouse, for instance, in the chapter entitled 'Les Casquets,' plays no real part in the wreck of the 'Matutina,' but Victor Hugo wanted to describe a lighthouse of the seventeenth century, because he had come upon a picture of the 'Lighthouse from Plymouth' in Beeverell's *Délices*; it appealed to him as being essentially unlike

the lighthouses of the nineteenth century, so he made a pen and ink sketch of the lighthouse (which is still to be seen among other Hugo treasures), and a word sketch of it in *L'Homme qui rit*. In the picture in the *Délices*, we are struck by the magnificence, the balconies, all the work of extravagant fancy which Hugo describes so eloquently, and we can read in plain letters, the inscription quoted by Hugo, 'Pax in Bello.' The description helps us to visualise the scene of the wrecks by putting before us a lighthouse of the seventeenth century.

But there is a still more striking example of Hugo's use of pictorial documents. Inside the caravan of Ursus, there are two inscriptions, the one dealing with the rights and privileges of the English nobleman (this we can almost entirely trace to Chamberlayne's *Present State of England*), the other describing the residences of the nobles of England. Nowhere do we find traces of the existence of Lord Linnoeus Clancharlie, father of the fictitious hero; the Count of Grantham, the Duke of Somerset, and the Count of Warwick are mentioned either in the list of peers or among the members of Parliament; Chamberlayne, too, makes mention of them. The detail given with reference to Warwick Castle is so general, it might apply to any old castle; Somerset House is not described outwardly as the other mansions are, but Hugo tells us of wonderful vases to be seen on the large mantelpiece. This detail with reference to the interior, as also details of the same nature, about Hartfield House, was added to the original manuscript; the long description of the interior of Grantham-Terrace Palace is not to be found in the *Délices*. But these exceptions—part of the details being later additions—do not disprove what seems to be fact—that Hugo drew his descriptions of all the other noble residences from the pictures given in the fifth volume of the *Délices*. Along with the pictures, there is a full list of the titles of the noblemen. The *Délices* furnishes us with three pictures of Grimsthorf in Lincolnshire, one being of the gardens; we notice that in this case Hugo's description is unusually long. Apart from the exceptions mentioned, Hugo confines himself to the description of the outside of the houses and the grounds; with the pictures of the *Délices* before us, we can count with him the number of buildings, towers, gables; we can admire the gateways, and the long façades; we can recognize the fish-ponds and the fountains in the artificially laid out gardens.

Hugo gives us those five pages of titles and descriptions partly because of his love of contrast—contrast between the poverty of the caravan, and the splendours which the inscription invokes, partly too

from the dramatic effect he can get from it, when Gwynplaine finds himself heir to those possessions he had been so familiar with from his childhood: but mostly because those sketches appealed to his imagination, and they seemed to him to supply the material required to give colour and body to his study of the English aristocracy.

Behind these inscriptions there is, we admit, some social idea. Again, at the end of *L'Homme qui rit*, when Gwynplaine makes his great speech before the House of Lords, he is made to use some of Beeverell's description to give colour to his social plea. Ribblechester is described as a village: mention is made of the herring-fishers of Harlech, though Hugo's imagination carries him further than the *Délices*; we read of the famine at Ailesbury, of Penck-ridge in Staffordshire, of Traith Maur and Traith-bichan,—which, however, the *Délices* does not place in Caernarvon,—and of Mont Pendlehill 'dont la cime produit une plante rare, qui, à cause de la hauteur du lieu où elle nait, porte le nom de Clowdesbery, la plante des nuées.'

Thus does Hugo use Beeverell to get the colour of England of the seventeenth century. He uses the *Délices* in various other less important ways—he takes from it a detail with regard to the taxation of wine and beer, or the increasing number of English warships, or again names of Peers or Commons, to supplement knowledge which he had gained from Chamberlayne.

There are cases when we cannot understand what motive Hugo had for borrowing, as, for instance, when Ursus talks of the 'Atrobates qui ont peuplé Berks, les belges qui ont habité le Somerset, et les Parisiens qui ont fondé York.' This phrase is an addition to the manuscript: so that it seems as if Hugo could not resist the temptation of introducing such a curious fact when he read in the *Délices* (vol. I), 'Au nord étoient les Parisiens qui habitoient la partie méridionale du Duché d'York...les Belges qui possédoient le Duché de Sommerset...les Atrebatiens qui possédoient le comté de Berck.' Perhaps after all, it is the kind of remark that an old philosopher of the type of Ursus would make.

It is curious to note thus exactly the use made by Hugo of one book. He read the *Délices*, noting here a fact, there a fact, which by its quaint picturesqueness, by its flavour of romance, by some suggestion of other times, other manners, or for some descriptive quality or colour-value recommended itself to his imagination. He did not question the accuracy of Beeverell, caring more for atmosphere and colour than for exactness; but if his mind was not of the critical nature that sifts its

material, and accepts only the surest information, yet his imagination knew exactly with what material it could work, what is the suggestive power of a name, how by some strange power of association, isolated facts of widely differing nature are linked together, so that they no longer remain disconnected, but become part of a great mosaic. And so it is that until we have understood the nature of the imagination of Hugo, we dare not accuse him of inaccuracy, nor distortion of facts, nor of plagiarism, nor of superficial observation; until we understand the constructive nature of his imagination, we can but see what his materials were, how he used them, and with what result; we do not attempt either to justify or condemn.

Christina M. Maclean.

Royal Holloway College,
Englefield Green, Surrey.

ÉTYMOLOGIE ET DÉRIVÉS ROMANS DU LAT. 'ACERNIA,' 'ACERNA.'

L'ART. 96 du *Roman. Etym. Wörterbuch* de M. Meyer-Lübke est ainsi conçu : '1. ACERNIA "Meerwolf," 2. ACERNA.—2. ital. *chierna* über serb.-kroat. *kiyerna*? andal. galiz. portg. *cherna* "sägebarsch" "orphe" über arab. *khernia*?'

Je trouve d'abord à redire à la traduction du lat. *acernia* par l'all. *meerwolf*. *Meerwolf* se dit de l'*anarrhichas lupus* L. et du *dicentrarchus labrax* Jordaens (= *labrax lupus* L.) ; c'est sans aucun doute ce dernier poisson que vise M. Meyer-Lübke. Mais le lat. *acernia* était plutôt un nom du *polyprion cernium* Val. ; cela est rendu probable, il me semble, par la glose *acernia* : ὄρφος (Gloss. III, 186. 60) ; en effet, d'après Carus, *Prodr.*, ii, 610, le *polyprion cernium* Val. se dit encore ῥόφος en Grèce, ὀρφός, ὀρφώς dans la Mer Egée ; cela est confirmé par le fait que le *polyprion cernium* Val. est un des deux poissons qui portent en roman des noms dérivés d'*acernia*.

Il est ici d'un certain intérêt de noter que si ὀρφός est toujours en néo-grec le nom du seul *polyprion cernium* Val., il est infiniment probable que c'est ce même poisson qui est indiqué dans le grec ancien par le nom d'ὀρφός (cf. ὄρφιον, ὀρφεύς, ὀρφίσκος, ὀρφακίνης comme noms de poissons). Le *polyprion cernium* Val. est nuagé d'un brun très sombre, ce qui fait croire qu'ὀρφός appartient au même radical que les adjectifs ὀρφνός, ὄρφνιος, ὀρφναῖος, 'sombre, foncé.' Comme le *polyprion cernium* Val. est une perche de mer, on peut comparer les relations entre πέρκη et l'adj. πέρκος et voir ce que j'ai dit sur l'it. *pesce perso* dans le *Revue des Lang. Rom.*, LIII, 45 (note 113).

Je reviens à l'article de M. Meyer-Lübke. On verra qu'il distingue deux formes : *acernia* et *acerna*. La seconde est en effet attestée dans un texte d'Oribase qu'on peut lire à l'art. *acharne* du *Thesaurus linguae latinae* : 'scorpius dracuri treclae acerna glaucus...in mari animalia.' *Acerna* et *acernia*, c'est sans doute toujours le même poisson. Mais les dérivés d'*acernia* ne sont pas mentionnés dans l'article de M. Meyer-Lübke bien qu'ils soient aussi nombreux que ceux d'*acerna*. Je cite d'après Carus, *Prodr.*, ii, 610 : Naples *cernia, cerniola de funnale,*

Livourne *cernia de scoglio*, Valence *jerna*, esp. *cherna* = *polyprion cernium* Val. (ajouter sans doute le port. *cherna, cherne*); sicil. *cernia*, Naples *cernia, cernia nera, cernia de scoglio*, Livourne *cernia* = *cerna gigas* Bonap. Le *lernio* de Mistral, expliqué par *scorpène marseillaise* (*scorpaena massiliensis* Risso = *polyprion cernium* Val.) doit être le *lernia* cité pour Nice par Risso et c'est sans doute une faute d'impression pour *cernia*. Le fr. *cernier*, nom générique des polyprions, semble avoir été employé pour la première fois par Cuvier, *Règne Animal*, II (1829), 145; c'est un emprunt au marseillais *cernié*. A en juger par *lacertus* > v. prov. *lazert*, on s'attendrait à *acernia* > v. prov. **azernha*; si les formes de la Provence ne sont pas des emprunts, elles témoignent en faveur d'une réduction ancienne d'*acernia, acerna* en *cernia, cerna*.

On aura remarqué que les dérivés d'*acerna* viennent de la péninsule ibérique, tandisque ceux d'*acernia* sont connus sur les côtes méditerranéennes de la France et de l'Italie. La forme *chierna* que M. Meyer-Lübke cite comme italienne et qui est usitée à Trieste[1] peut très bien être pour **chernia*; cf. à Venise *chieppa* à côté de *cheppia* = *clupea alosa* Cuv. D'autre part, Traina, dans son *Vocabolarietto* donne à côté de *cernia* la forme *cerna* comme sicilienne; il se peut qu'elle existe ailleurs sur le littoral italien; on s'en sert à Malte; elle est le point de départ de *cerna*, employé pour la première fois par Bonaparte comme nom, dans le latin des naturalistes, d'un genre de serrans; en effet, le sicil. *cernia, cerna* est un nom de la *cerna gigas* Bonap. et non du *polyprion cernium* Val. *Cernium*, comme nom spécifique, du *polyprion cernium* Val., vient des formes provençales déjà citées. Reste à dire un mot sur *cernua* dont certains naturalistes se sont servis (*cernua gigas* Costa, *perca cernua* Aradas = *cerna gigas* Bonap.); elle provient, je crois, d'une fausse étymologie: on aura vu dans le sic. *cerna* un dérivé de *cernua*, forme féminine de l'adj. *cernuus* 'courbé, dont la tête penche en avant' à cause de la tête penchée fort en avant de la *cerna gigas* Bonap. Déjà Linné s'était servi de l'expression *perca cernua* pour une petite perche d'eau douce, l'*acerina cernua* Cuv., dont la tête offre une conformation semblable. Rondelet (*De Pisc. Marin.*, ed. 1554, p. 157), parlant de son *orphus*, qui n'est autre que l'*anthias sacer* Bloch, a soin de nous dire: 'orphum vero hic non depingimus eum, qui a Graecis quibusdam hodie vulgari lingua *ὀρφοῦ* nomine dicitur[2]'; puis il rappelle que *ὀρφός* a été traduit *cernua* par Gaza.

[1] C'est un nom de la *cerna gigas* Bonap.

[2] Il émet la prétention de parler de l'*ὀρφός* d'Aristote et d'Athénée et de l'*orphus* de Pline.

Traina traduit le sicil. *cernia, cerna* par l'it. *lucerna.* On trouve, en effet, dans Carus, *Prodr.*, ii, 609, 610, 612, *lucerna* (*lüxerna*), comme noms à Gênes de trois serrans: le *paracentropristis hepatus* Klunz (d'après Bonaparte), le *polyprion cernium* Val. (d'après Sassi), le *serranus scriba* Cuv. (d'après Faujas). Casaccia, dans la deuxième édition de son *Dizionario Genovese* ne donne *lüxerna* que comme nom du *polyprion cernium* Val. On peut se demander si *lüxerna* = *polyprion cernium* Val. n'est pas en partie dû aux dérivés d'*acerna.* D'autre part *lucerna* est un nom de poisson dans Pline. En roman, ce nom sert à divers poissons. À Gênes même, *lucerna* indique le *capros aper* Lac.; à Naples *lucerna, pesce lucerna* = *uranoscopus scaber* L. (cf. néo-grec λύχνος); sur les côtes de l'Adriatique, de Venise jusque chez les Croates, les dérivés de *lucerna* servent à la nomenclature de divers poissons du genre *trigla* Cuv., la *trigla corax* Bonap., la *trigla lyra* L., la *trigla obscura* L. En anglais on trouve *lantern-gurnard* comme nom de trigle; dans la Cornouailles *lantern-fish* = *arnoglossus megastoma* Günther, d'après Pennant, *Brit. Zool.*, ed. 1769, iii, 191 ('on account of its transparency,' dit Pennant); Day, *British Fishes*, ii, 233, cite encore *lantern sprat*, nom donné à une sardine infectée par un parasite qui est lumineux pendant la nuit. Le fr. *lanterne* est dans le Boulonnais un nom du *conger vulgaris* Cuv. (Rolland, *Faune Populaire*, iii, 98). Je suppose qu'il s'agit de phosphorescences qui seraient plus ou moins marquées selon les poissons; mais les traités spéciaux d'ichthyologie ne disent rien de particulier qui permette de confirmer ce point de vue.

Quelle est l'origine du lat. *acernia, acerna* = *polyprion cernium* Val.? *Acharne*, nom de poisson se trouve dans Pline, *Hist. Nat.*, XXXII, 145: 'peculiares...maris : acipenser, aurata, asellus, acharne, aphye.' *Acharne* est tiré du grec ἀχάρνη; on trouve comme noms de poissons, à côté d'ἀχάρνη, diverses formes, ἄχαρνος etc., sur lesquelles on trouvera les renseignements nécessaires à l'art. ἀχάρνας du *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* d'H. Estienne, ed. Didot, 1831–1856, Vol. I, partie 2, col. 2740 et 2741. J'en extrais la phrase: ἀχαρνὼς καὶ ὀρφὼς ὁ αὐτός (citée avec renvoi à Grammat. Bekk. 474. 1). Si ὀρφός = *polyprion cernium* Val., il semble bien qu'ἀχάρνη etc. se disait du même poisson. Cela mérite d'être noté parce que les naturalistes se sont servis d'*acarne* et d'*orphus* comme termes spécifiques indiquant des poissons tout autres que le *polyprion cernium* Val. (*pagellus acarne* Cuv.[1]; *pagrus orphus* Cuv., *aurata orphus* Risso, variété du *pagrus vulgaris* Cuv.).

Le grec ἀχάρνη, emprunté en latin, aurait donné **acarna* et sans

[1] Rondelet, *De Pisc. Marin.*, ed. 1554, p. 151, chapitre *de Acarnane.*

doute *acerna*; cf. *Acarnania, Acernania*, comme nom d'une partie de l'Épire. L'*acharne* de Pline est une forme savante. Mais si *acerna* vient d'*ἀχάρνη*, comment expliquer *acernia*, qui est la forme la plus souvent attestée? A propos de la glose *acernum*: *σφενδάμνινον ὄρφος* (Gloss. II, 13. 40), les auteurs du *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* se sont naturellement demandé s'il y avait contamination par *acernus*. Si l'on admet cette idée de contamination par *acernus*, on pourrait supposer que l'existence d'*acernia*, à côté d'*acerna*, a été provoquée par l'adj. *acerneus*, qu'on trouve à côté de l'adj. *acernus*, et qui a la même signification. Cependant, il importe de dire que cet adjectif *acerneus* n'est attesté que par deux textes. On le trouve dans les œuvres d'un poète chrétien du VI^e^ siècle, Venantius Fortunatus; or, Venantius Fortunatus se sert d'*acernus* au sens d'*acer* (cf. dans l'ouvrage déjà cité de M. Meyer-Lübke, l'art. 97 pour les dérivés romans d'*acernus* ayant le sens 'érable'; cf. aussi l'art. 95 *acereus*), ce qui peut faire croire qu'il sentait *acerneus* comme dérivé d'*acernus* plutôt que d'*acer*. Le second exemple d'*acerneus* se trouve dans une inscription fragmentaire (Corp. XIV, 2794).

Quoiqu'il en soit, la contamination, si contamination il y a, n'a été possible que parce qu'*acerna* (< *ἀχάρνη*) se confondait phonétiquement avec *acerna*, forme féminine de l'adjectif *acernus*. Elle pourrait avoir été favorisée du côté sémasiologique par une comparaison entre la dureté bien connue du bois d'érable et la dureté de la chair du poisson; on peut lire dans l'ouvrage de médecine attribué, sans doute à tort, à Plinius Valerianus, la phrase: 'pisces duras habentes carnes qualis est *acernia*.' Mais on se heurte ici à une difficulté car il paraît admis que la chair du *polyprion cernium* Val. est tendre (voir, p. ex. Railliet, *Traité de Zoologie Médic. et Agric.*, p. 972). D'autre part, la chair du *polyprion cernium* Val. est blanche et le bois de l'érable est blanc. Cela me rappelle que Boisacq, *Dict. Etym. de la langue Grecque*[1], note que Prellwitz, dans les *Beiträge* de Bezzenberger, XXIV, 106 sq., proposait, sous réserve, de rattacher le grec *ἀχάρνας*, *ἄχαρνος*, noms de poissons au radical d'*ἀχερωίς* 'peuplier blanc.' Je ne sais s'il faut encore ajouter ici que l'érable est particulièrement sujet au broussin, excroissance qui présente des veines colorées; tandisque la peau rugueuse du *polyprion cernium* Val. lui a valu les noms de *pampol rascas* à Valencia et de *fanfre rascas* à Cette et l'a fait ailleurs comparer aux scorpènes: Adria *scarpaena di sasso*, Trieste *scarpaena salvatica* = *polyprion cernium* Val.

PAUL BARBIER FILS.

LEEDS.

[1] A l'art. *ἀχερωίς*.

A NOTE ON THE DIALECT OF BEROUL'S 'TRISTAN' AND A CONJECTURE.

M. Muret has utilised for his determination of the dialect of the Tristan poem of MS. 2171 five characteristics of the poet's pronunciation, viz. the Western or North-Western retention of *ei*, *o* tonic free, of *ẽ* and of *k* hard before *a* and the francien pronunciation of the groups ɛ + *jod* and ɔ + *jod*, and has located the poem, in consequence, in East Normandy 'à l'est du Calvados, dans les départements de l'Eure et de la Seine Inférieure[1].' The amount of support furnished by the rhymes for each of the above traits varies considerably however, and I am by no means convinced that the case is made out for the fifth. The evidence for it is set forth by the editor in these terms:

'Les syllabes contenant un ancien *è* ou un ancien *ò* diphtongués et suivis d'un phonème palatal ne sont pas nombreuses à la rime. Néanmoins les prononciations *l* et *ui* semblent bien établies par les homophonies suivantes: *li* : *merci* 1075–6, *li* : *cri* 1225–6, *quit* : *nuit* 721–2, *sui* : *ennui* 2419–20, *sui* : *ancui* 3229–30. Les rimes *dime* : *aprime* (3567–8) et *pris* : *puis* (4439–40) associent un *i* derivé de l'ancienne triphtongue *ui* avec la diphtongue *ui*, continuatrice de l'ancienne triphtongue *uei*[2].'

With all due respect to the learned editor I would point out that this summary is faulty in two respects: it adduces rhymes that have no weight in this question and omits several of considerable significance. Of the first category are the rhymes of the group ɔ + *jod* with *sui*, for *sui* undoubtedly contains that same group, however that fact is accounted for[3], and also the rhymes of the groups in question with each other, for such rhymes occur frequently in texts in which the

[1] Introd. pp. lix—lxi.
[2] Introd. pp. xxxvii—xxxviii.
[3] Cf. Suchier, *Die französische und provenzalische Sprache*, p. 773.

provincial pronunciation of these sounds is attested[1]. The rhymes omitted are as follows:—

sire : *dire* 85, 425, 3361, 4213, : *ire* 181, 989, 2581, *empire* : *ocire* 2025, : *escondire* 3057.

lui : *sui* (?) 2145.

lit : *nuit* 655.

aqeut : *porseut* 2155, *degiez* : *plungiez* 3847, *deget* (?) : *vaslet*[2] 3935.

Of these rhymes those with *sire* and *empire* range themselves alongside the three given by M. Muret and thus seem to support his view of the poet's pronunciation. Their value, however, is admittedly slight in this question—a fact which presumably accounts for their omission. *Sire* is a title word, found in all parts of N. France; *empire* is a borrowed word, and both occur in poems characterised by the provincial pronunciation of this group[3].

The rhyme *lui* : *sui* would afford stronger evidence if certain, but the MS. has *fui* and the emendation is rather doubtful.

The rhyme *lit* : *nuit* affords another instance of the groups in question rhyming together and so adds but little to our knowledge. The last three, on the other hand, appear to me to be highly significant. All three depend upon a pronunciation of the group ɛ + *jod* in which the stressed element is some form of *e* and so attest directly a provincial pronunciation of the sound, i.e. the pronunciation that obtained in South-West Normandy and districts further south.

In such a case as this in which provincial and francien pronunciation of the same sound seem to be attested one would be inclined to admit on mere a priori grounds that the provincial pronunciation was the poet's own—provincial writers are admittedly more prone to pick up francien rhymes than francien writers provincial ones. But as a matter of fact it is not necessary to rest content with assumption, however reasonable it may appear. In his careful study of the language of the poem M. Muret has noted the existence of several other traits that point to a more southerly origin of the poem than the one finally fixed upon by him himself. Of these traits the clearest seem to me to be

[1] E.g. *Roman de Thèbes*, *Livre des Manières*, cf. Constans' edition of the *Roman de Thèbes* II, p. lxxvi.

[2] If Tobler is right in taking the *sut* of l. 1541 to be *sequit (Zts. f. Rom. Ph.* xxx), this rhyme should be included in this list (*sut* : *conut*). I include the rhyme *gist* : *ist* of 1779 among those of identical vowel sound. (Cf. Suchier, *Altfranzösische Grammatik*, § 35.)

[3] Cf. the *Chanson de Roland; Livre des Manières*. Cf. also *Roman de Thèbes*, p. lxxx (*sire*).

the consistent pronunciation of *femina* as *fenne* (: *regne, cane*[1]) and of *mot* as *mọt*[2], and the occasional use of the 3rd sg. of weak perfects in *-it* and *ut*[3] (side by side with *-i* and *u*) and of present participial forms in *-ent*[4], and to these may be added the enclitic form of *vos*. Separately these traits may seem to be of slight importance, but combined they are of considerable weight because all five are found more or less consistently in the group of writers that belong to the district comprising S.W. Normandy and the district further south[5]. Their appearance in the Beroul fragment seems to me to link it unmistakably to this S.-Westerly group of poems and so to support my contention that the provincial pronunciation of the group ɛ + *jod*, and ɔ + *jod*, common to this group, is the one to be postulated for the poet[6].

If now we take this trait as proved and combine it with the other four utilised by the editor we shall find ourselves with no wide choice of locality for the poet. The district in which the provincial pronunciation of the groups ɛ + *jod* and ɔ + *jod* is used together with the hard *k* is limited to a small part of S.W. Normandy, i.e. the district lying roughly between Caen and Granville and comprising the West part of the department Calvados and the greater part of the department Manche[7].

If this determination of the dialect be right the numerous examples of the graphy *ie* for ɛ + *jod* (*prie, mie, lie, liez, seurre*) would belong to the original and save us from postulating an intermediary as the editor suggests[8].

Is it merely attributable to accident that the distribution of some of the linguistic traits just noted varies somewhat in the poem? Is it just chance that the rhymes depending on the francien pronunciation of the groups ɛ + *jod* and ɔ + *jod* occur only in the first part of the poem (e.g. ll. 721/2, 1075/6, 1225/6, 2145 (?)), while those attesting a more provincial pronunciation (*fenne, mot,* &c.) are scattered throughout? Is it not rather an indication that we have in the poem of MS. 2171 not the work of two poets 'Beroul et un Anonyme,' but of one remanieur-poet Beroul, one who scorned not to adapt old material when it lay before him, but who was equally ready to invent freely when the old material failed or did not suit him?

[1] Introd. p. xlii. [2] Introd. p. xl. [3] *Id.* p. xlviii. [4] *Id.* p. xli.
[5] E.g. Wace, *Livre des Manières, Chronique des Ducs de Normandie, Troie, Thèbes.*
[6] My impression is that other traits point to the same conclusion—e.g. the corruption of the declension, and some of the nasal vowel rhymes quoted on p. xliii of the introduction—but I have not had time to verify this impression.
[7] Cf. Suchier's maps in Groeber's *Grundriss.*
[8] p. xxxviii.

Some such hypothesis would explain much that is difficult and even contradictory in the poem—not only the unequal distribution of linguistic traits, but also the main literary characteristics described by M. Muret, e.g. the combination of the general resemblance of tone and treatment that runs through the fragment with the perceptible variations between the two parts and the varying degree of concordance of this version with that of Eilhart von Oberge. If we can take it that we have preserved to us in the fragment the work of Beroul a remanieur-poet utilising and recasting old material in the first part of the poem (in the fountain scene, the discovery scenes and escape of the lovers, the woodland life—all the scenes that march with Eilhart's version), but inventing freely and so displaying stronger verve and enjoyment and a more consistently later technique[1] in the second part, we may not indeed rid ourselves of all the difficulties of the question, for minor contradictions and obscurities remain, but we have, I think, a better solution of all the more important problems involved than that offered by the double authorship theory.

MILDRED K. POPE.

OXFORD.

[1] E.g. in treatment of the couplet, cf. Borrmann in Vollmöller's *Romanische Forschungen*, xxv. pp. 320[i and k].

RABELAIS ON LANGUAGE BY SIGNS.

THE origin of language was no new subject when it was taken up by the Schoolmen, using the text of Genesis ii, 19, 20: 'And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto the man to see what he would call them: and whatsoever the man called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And the man gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field.' The general attitude towards this question may be seen in the notes of Nicolaus De Lyra (1270—1340), the Jew who became a Franciscan or a Dominican, and in 1320 finished his commentary on the Bible, which was in use till the Reformation. His commentary runs as follows: Gen. ii, 19 '*ut videret quid vocaret ea.* diligenter considerando naturas eorum; quarum primus homo habuit perfectam notitiam....Deus formavit hominem perfectum, non solum quantum ad corpus...sed etiam quantum ad animum in scientia ad quam potuit naturaliter attingere, ut statim posset docere.'

Gen. ii, 20 '*Omne enim quod vocavit Adam* etc. secundum veritatem; ex qua prius habuit notitiam de proprietatibus naturalibus viventium: quia nomina bene imposita a proprietatibus rerum imponuntur.'

The naming of objects by one man is alluded to by Plato (*Tim.* 78 E) *ὁ τὰς ἐπωνυμίας θέμενος*. Cicero says (*Tusc. D.* i, § 62): 'Aut qui primus, quod summae sapientiae Pythagorae visum est, omnibus rebus imposuit nomina.' Bacon (*Interpr. of Nature*, c. 1) writes: 'Behold, it was not that pure light of natural knowledge whereby man in paradise was able to give unto every living creature a name according to his propriety, which gave occasion to the fall.' Cf. also Cope on Aristotle's *Rhet.* i, 1. § 8.

Thus we see that the original perfect man was credited with the knowledge of the properties of every thing and the nomenclature which designated it. With the deterioration of humanity, or with

the confusion of tongues at Babel, this knowledge was lost or became imperfect, while we find in Homer three or four objects bearing two names, one a god-given name, which denotes some essential inherent quality, as is maintained by Plato in the *Cratylus* (391 D) *ὅτι οἵ γε θεοὶ αὐτὰ καλοῦσι πρὸς ὀρθότητα ἅπερ ἐστι φύσει ὀνόματα.* Thus the god-given name of the bird *χαλκίς* (*Il.* xx, 291) is its real name, while *κύμινδις* is some fanciful human appellation. Rabelais burlesques this in iv, N. prol. Jupiter, in a 'consistory' of the Gods, speaks of 'Africa; so do mortals call that town on the Mediterranean, which we call Aphrodisium.' Thus arose the controversy of *ὀνόματα φύσει ἢ θέσει*, Plato inclining to the one in his *Cratylus* and Aristotle maintaining the theory *θέσει οὐ φύσει.* Other writers ranged themselves on one or the other side. Hippocrates, *De Arte* § 2, declares that 'forms are natural, words are made by custom.' Gellius (x, 4) quotes Nigidius: 'multa argumenta dicit cur videri possint verba esse naturalia quam arbitraria.' Sir T. Browne (*Pseud. Epid.* vi, 1) says 'Speech is by instruction, not by instinct.'

But, though the *Cratylus* is mentioned by Rabelais in iv, 37 and an allusion to one of Plato's etymologies *οἶνος, ὅτι οἴεσθαι νοῦν ἔχειν ποιεῖ* (*Crat.* 406 C) is found in v, 46, and perhaps *δαίμονες = δαήμονες* (*Crat.* 396 B) is aimed at in *Pant.* 18 ('y a il homme tant sçavant que sont les diables?' this is, however, a commonplace in the chivalric romances, *e.g.* Merlin I, 3), it is in iii, 19 that the Platonic doctrine is combated: 'It is a mistake to say that we have language by nature; languages exist by arbitrary institutions and agreements of the nations. Vocables (as the dialecticians say) have signification, not naturally but arbitrarily.'

Rabelais, who knew his Herodotus, naturally quotes the entertaining experiment of Psammetichus, King of Egypt, who determined that Phrygian was the oldest language from the word *Bekos* ('bread' in Phrygian), which was the first word uttered by two children who had been carefully secluded so as not to hear speech of any kind. This is cleverly versified by Claudian *in Eutrop.* II, 251:

> Dat cuncta vetustas
> principium Phrygibus; nec rex Aegyptius ultra
> restitit, humani postquam puer uberis expers
> in Phrygiam primum laxavit murmura vocem.

Rabelais perhaps inclined to Ionic as the oldest language, when he puts it in the mouth of the old Macrobius (iv, 25); possibly as the language of Hippocrates and Herodotus, or following Pliny vii, 210:

'Gentium consensus tacitus primus omnium conspiravit ut Ionum litteris uterentur.' The 'Etruscan letters' which he finds in *Garg.* 1 he probably looked upon as Lydian, and so connected with Ionic.

The method of divination styled 'Onomatomancy,' scoffed at by Panurge in iii, 25, crops up again later in iv, 37, when the *Cratylus* is mentioned on the subject of bestowing names of good omen on the captains in command against the Chitterlings. The practice is supported by instances from Roman imperial history, and the doctrine is derived from Cicero *De Divin.* i, § 103, which is backed by Herod. IX, 91 and Liv. V, 65. From Pliny xxviii, 33 is derived also the Pythagorean discovery that names of an odd number of syllables indicate perfections or defects on the right side of the human body, while those of an even number of syllables concern the left side. This probably comes direct from Pliny, though it is to be found in Agrippa *Occ. Phil.* ii, 20 under the title *Arithmomantia*, and in the *De Van. Scient.* c. 15 (*De Sorte Pythagorica*). These last treatises were much employed by Rabelais. At the end of this episode 'Mardigras,' in the shape of a sow, is declared to be the tutelary god of the Chitterlings; for they are extracted from swine; while at the encounter in iv, 41, in trying to pronounce the word, Gymnast says *Gradimars* (= fat tithe-collectors), a terrible insult to the Chitterlings. *Di-mars* is the form at Toulouse of *Mar-di*, so that in reality Gradimars is only a dialectic variety of Mardigras. It is pointed out in Macrobius on Verg. *Aen.* ii, 351 ('*Excessere omnes adytis arisque relictis | Di quibus imperium hoc steterat*') that the tutelary gods of Troy had deserted that city on being summoned forth by their proper names (*Sat.* iii, 9). For this reason also the Romans scrupulously concealed the real name of their city. Philostratus (*Vit. Apoll.* iv, 16) relates how Apollonius restored a dead girl to life by calling upon her by her proper name.

Rabelais again scoffs at this 'science' in v, 18 when he represents Henri Cotiral, a double of Her Trippa, styling a cabbage, which he held up to view, *lunaria major*, no doubt on account of the similarity of its leaves to the fronds of the *lunaria minor*, or *botrychium lunaria* (Moonwort), the strange fern dear to Alchymists, mentioned in Chaucer, *C. T.*, *G.* 800 (ed. Skeat). This little plant, with the seeds on one stalk and its crescent-shaped fronds on the other, was considered of mystic potency. In Du Bartas (*La Semaine*, 3rd Day, l. 604) it is credited with the powers of a magnet, so as to draw the nails out of horses' shoes. Similarly many plants obtained names from medical botanists by reason of the likeness of their leaves to organs in the human body,

for which they were therefore believed to provide remedies. Allusions to this may be found in Sir T. Browne, *Pseud. Epid.* ii, 6. 5, Corn. Agrippa, *Occ. Phil.* i, 23 and *Hudibras* iii, 1. 329:

> Seek out for plants with signatures
> And quack of universal cures.

Vitruvius (II, 1, § 1) has a theory derived perhaps from Lucretius (V, 1039—1105) that men living in a primitive state were brought together by forest fires that had been kindled by boughs of trees when rubbed together by the wind. When the fire had subsided they appreciated the warmth and, gathering round it, made signs and sounds to one another, which being constantly repeated became recognized and understood. This he suggests was the origin of language. Some of them began to make covered dwellings of boughs and leaves, others to dig caves under mountains, while others, in imitation of the nests and constructions of swallows, wattled together sticks and plastered them with mud, making places in which they could find shelter. This was the beginning of architecture.

The episode of the argumentation of Thaumast and Panurge by signs (*Pant.* 19), the signs exhibited by Nazdecabre (iii, 20), and Pantagruel's interpretation (iii, 45, 46) put upon the words and gestures of Triboulet the fool, are all part of the same investigation, namely, the origin of language and the primitive communication of thoughts by signs and otherwise. The signs made by Panurge to Thaumast are mostly coarse symbols of derision used in mockery, and intended to bring into contempt the keeping of acts at the Sorbonne, while the signs made by Nazdecabre are in some cases the actual symbols employed in antiquity to indicate numbers and the meanings expressed by numbers. A fairly complete list of such notation or 'supputation' (cf. Ovid, *Pont.* ii, 3. 18, *sollicitis supputat articulis*) is given in a short treatise mentioned by Rabelais in *Pant.* 18, *Baeda De Numeris et Signis.* The actual title is *De Computo vel Loquela Digitorum,* and it forms chap. 1 of the *De Temporum Ratione* of the 'venerable Bede,' or calculations to find the Church festivals during the year.

Eighteen positions of the fingers of the left hand expressed the 9 units and the 9 tens; the same on the right the 9 hundreds and the 9 thousands (cf. Mayor, *Juv.* x, 249, *dextra jam computat annos*): 10,000 and higher numbers were expressed by moving the hands to various parts of the bodies. This is a summary of the system set forth in detail by Baeda. The numbers also had different meanings attached to

them, as is shewn in Martianus Capella, when the goddess Arithmetic salutes Jupiter with the number 717 (Mayor). The number of 'the beast' will readily occur.

In Froben's edition of the Epistle of Jerome against Jovinianus Erasmus gives Scholia: 'Nec desunt qui ferant extare Baedae libellum in quo hujusmodi numerandi ratio tradatur: verum eum non potuimus nancisci.' Scholia in *Epist. I adv. Jovin.* In an appendix to *Epist. II adv. Jovin.* Erasmus says that a friend, Ludovicus Berus of Basel (cf. *Epist. Erasm.* No. 488 vol. II, ed. Allen), had lent him this book. He then proceeds to give a summary of Baeda's system. This note had probably been seen by Rabelais, who, I think, is indebted to the *Epist. adv. Jov.* for some other points. In iii, 30 the first sign made by Nazdecabre is correctly interpreted: Baeda puts it: 'Cum dicis triginta, ungues indicis et pollicis blando conjunges amplexu' and he also says that this number has reference 'ad nuptias.'

The second sign of Nazdecabre, by which he is said to indicate the Quinary number, is the ordinary natural one of holding up the five fingers of the left hand. Baeda's symbol for this is raising the medical finger of the left hand. The right hand with the thumb extended and placed above the al Katim, that is the five lowest lumbar vertebrae (i.e. the loins), indicates 900,000. The thumb of the right hand placed between the joints of the middle and medical fingers indicates 200. The raising of the index and the little fingers is not so easily made out, but the passing of the right thumb up the chest to the neck seems to indicate 200, 300, 400 thousand progressively. Beyond this Baeda's system gives no clear explanation. It seems probable, however, that Rabelais did not trouble to make out these intricate signs, excepting for purposes of ridicule.

Quintilian who gives careful directions for the use of the fingers to emphasise the effects of rhetoric (*Inst. Or.* xi, 3, 92 sqq.) also remarks in lib. i, 'si digitorum solum incerto aut indecoro gestu a computatione dissentit'; probably referring to some Rabelaisian employment of gesticulation.

Another illustration but a more general one of 'the universal language of gesture and countenance,' as Gibbon calls it (c. 59), is given in iii, 20 by a story from Lucian (*De Salt.* c. 64): An Eastern potentate who ruled over nations of many languages begged from Nero as a present a player of farces, who was a master of gesticulation. By means of this man, he said, he would be able to speak to any of his different peoples without any other interpreter. In his *Jupiter*

Tragœdus, 7, Lucian represents Hermes as wishing to address an assembly of strange gods by signs; he was not linguist enough to speak intelligibly to Scythians, etc. The powers of gesticulation among modern Neapolitans are notorious.

It is not quite clear what Panurge means when he tells Pantagruel in this chapter that it is paradoxical to say that no man ever spoke who had not heard speech. The generalization alluded to is probably that of Pliny (x, 69, § 88) 'nec sunt naturaliter surdi ut non iidem sint et muti.' This seems to be contradicted in one of the *Problemata* (No. 138 in Politian's translation) of Alexander of Aphrodisias, a book referred to by Rabelais more than once: 'Quidam vero medicorum dicunt unam esse nervorum conjugationem quae ad linguam quaeque ad aures pertineat: quo fit ut affectuum quoque consensus iis accidat: qui autem ex accidenti sunt muti surdi omnino non sunt; localis enim oritur nervorum passio.' A story is then told from the lawyer Bartolus in a gloss on ff. XLV, 1. 1, § 17, to the effect that an Italian who had become deaf by accident, could still understand whatever was said in Italian, merely by observing the movement of the speaker's lips. This is not uncommon nowadays and is known as 'lip-language.' Possibly Rabelais had also in mind the temporary dumbness of Zacharias in Luc. i, 20 and 64, to which he refers in *Garg.* 7.

W. F. Smith.

Geneva.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Identification of Don Philipe des Marays, Viceroy de Papeligosse in 'Gargantua,' c. 15.

In a note on No. 180 of the Letters of Erasmus (ed. Allen, Clarendon Press, vol. I) it is explained that the Johannes Paludanus, to whom the letter is addressed, is a John des Marays who had shewn kindness and hospitality to Erasmus. The letter is a sort of *apologia* for the *Panegyricus*, which Erasmus had addressed to Philip, archduke of Austria, father of Charles V and son-in-law of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. This letter was prefixed to the *Panegyricus* by Badius in his edition of 1507, and subsequently both were prefixed, together with other matter, to the edition of the *Institutio Principis Christiani* dedicated by Erasmus to Charles V in 1516 on his accession to the throne of Spain.

Froben, the Basle printer, continued this in his editions of 1518 and 1519, so that Rabelais, who in this part of his *Gargantua* (cc. 14—24) was busy with schemes of education, might naturally turn to Erasmus, of whom he was a great admirer and from whom he borrowed so much. He seems, however, to have taken but little from the *Institutio*, but I suggest that he borrowed the names of Don Philip and Des Marays as sponsors to his own system of education. In order to give local colour he chose the neighbouring province of Berry, in which was Palluau, the home of one of the six pilgrims (c. 45), and la Brene, notorious for its pools and marshes (cf. *Revue des études rabelaisiennes*, VII, 75). Don Philipe Des Marays, or Paludanus, would thus appear as a friend and neighbour of Grandgousier.

As to Papeligosse, I am inclined to agree with M. Sainéan in *Rev. des études rab.* VII, 353, that it is a combination of Pampeluna and Saragossa, both of which occur frequently in the Carolingian romances. M. Sainéan records also that even now in Saintonge *Pampelune* is used to express vaguely some distant country. Rabelais might therefore employ Papeligosse to indicate Spain, or Castile, of

which Philip was formally recognized as regent two months before his death in 1506. Thus Don Philipe Des Marays, viceroy of Papeligosse, is concocted out of Paludanus and Don Philip of Castile.

Rabelais again would not have been displeased if the name Papeligosse set his readers on the track of the Papacy.

In this book Rabelais had begun to borrow considerably from Erasmus. In this very chapter correspondence may be remarked in the following passages.

Garg. c. 15.	Erasmi *Colloquia* (*Monitoria Paedagogica*).
un jeune paige de Ville Gongys (en Berry) tant bien testonné, tant bien tiré, tant honneste en son maintien....	Vestis item ad decorum componatur, ut totus cultus, vultus, gestus et habitus corporis ingenuam modestiam et verecundam indolem prae se ferat.
Eudemon...le bonnet au poing, la face ouverte...les yeulx assurez et le regard assis sus Gargantua, se tint sus ses pieds et commença le louer.	Compone te in rectum corporis statum, aperi caput. Vultus sit...hilari modestia temperatus, oculi verecundi, semper intenti in eum cui loqueris.
Le tout fut proferé avec gestes tant propres, prononciation tant distincte, voix tant eloquente....	Cum loqueris, distincte, clare, articulate consuescito proferre verba tua.
Ibid.	
Chopiner *theologalement* (later edd. substitute *sophisticquement*).	*Adag.* iii, 2. 37. Hac tempestate apud Parisios vulgari ioco vinum theologicum vocant quod sit validissimum.
Ibid.	
sou comme un Angloys.	*Adag.* ii, 2. 68 (*ad fin.*) tam satur est quam Anglus.

'Un Emilius du temps passé' is probably derived from *la Aemiliana eloquentia* of the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (c. 11, g. 7 recto) which is used in the *Gargantua* and very largely in the Fifth Book.

W. F. Smith.

Geneva.

Paolo Rolli and the Society for the Encouragement of Learning.

As is well known, Paolo Rolli, the Italian poet and rival of Metastasio, came over to England with Lord Sembuch and made this country his home from 1715 to 1747[1]. During his long residence in London he taught the Italian language, wrote some 'melodramas,' edited the works of several Italian poets with critical notes, and translated Milton's

[1] Cp. S. Fassini, *Il ritorno del Rolli dall' Inghilterra*, Perugia, 1908, and *Il melodramma italiano a Londra ai tempi del Rolli*, in *Rivista musicale italiana*, xix, fasc. 1.

Paradise Lost into Italian. He was a member of the Royal Society, and when the Society for the Encouragement of Learning was founded in London in 1736, a society which only existed till 1748, he was possibly also a member of that body. On February 10, 1738, he addressed a letter to the Committee of the Society, asking for assistance to print, in the *Collana Latina*, an Italian manuscript translation of Cicero's *Tusculanae Quaestiones*, the translation being done, as he says, 'in perfect Toscan about y^e^ End of y^e^ 15th Century.' Specimens of the MS. were sent, as we learn from the *Memoirs* of the Society[1], to Italy, and these 'having been approved of by several learned men in that country as well as other good judges here,' the Committee replied to Signor Rolli on April 22 of the same year, agreeing 'that two hundred and fifty copies of the said book be accordingly printed.' Unfortunately, as we read on the margin of the reply, 'this was not done.' Why the project was not carried out or what became of the MS. we do not know. We append a copy of Rolli's letter to the Society (Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 6190).

Honorable Gentlemeń,

I humbly take y^e^ Liberty to lay before you an excellent M^script^ of an Italian Translation of y^e^ *Tusculan Questions by Cicero.* The work is done in perfect Toscan about y^e^ End of y^e^ 15^th^ Century. Brian Fairfax Esq. y^e^ Vice-President is y^e^ Proprietor of y^e^ Ms. & from him I have obtained y^e^ permission of publishing it, for there is wanting a good Translation of this very work in a Series of Books, which y^e^ Italian call *Collana Latina.* If you think an elegant Edition in a Royal Octavo of this fine MS. worthy y^e^ assistence of your generous Institution; I do implore it, & will transcribe it in the modern Hortography. I conceive y^e^ whole wont exeed 18 sheets. I am with all due respect

Honorable Gentlemen
Your most humble & most obsequious Servant
paul rolli.

Malborug Street
Feb. y^e^ 10. 173$\frac{7}{8}$

F. VIGLIONE.

BENEVENTO.

[1] *Memoirs of the Society etc.* in Add. MSS. of the British Museum, 6185.

Jonathan Richardson and Portraits of Dante.

My attention has been called to an interesting eighteenth century reference to portraits of Dante, which escaped my notice when I was compiling my book on *Dante in English Literature* (published in 1909). In *An Account of Some of the Statues, Bas-Reliefs, Drawings and Pictures in Italy &c., with Remarks.* By Jonathan Richardson Sen. and Jun. (London, 1722), the younger Richardson (who was the real author of the book, for his father never was in Italy) observes that in the Farnese Palace at Rome,

> 'I was shewn a Head as That of him that built *Constantinople*, This is sufficiently Absurd; but 'tis usual enough to meet with such Silly Accounts of things from those that have the shewing of them, whoever it is that furnish them with such, or however they Mistake, or Confound things: this is a Head of *Dante*; I have seen Several, tho' in different Attitudes, as in the Dome of *Florence*, at the Elector *Palatines*, my Father's Drawing, &c. when I came to Rome I was confirm'd in this Opinion, which is the same I had of it at first Sight; the *Virtuosi* there knew the Head, and that it was as I judg'd. 'Twas not done however in *Dante's* time, the Work is more Modern, and Better; 'tis Excellent.' (p. 145.)

Signor Parodi, in a review of Mr Holbrook's *Portraits of Dante* in the latest number of the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana* (N. S. XIX, 94 n.), makes the interesting suggestion that this 'head' of Dante may have been the now well-known Naples bronze bust. From the context, however, it would appear that Richardson was referring rather to a drawing than to a bust. The portrait 'at the Elector Palatines,' and the drawing in the possession of the elder Richardson, I have been unable to identify. The picture 'in the Dome of Florence' is that by Domenico di Michelino (formerly attributed to Orcagna), of which Richardson gives an 'account' in an earlier chapter of his book, where he again mentions his father's drawing of Dante. Under 'Florence.—*The Dome,*' he writes:

> 'There are many Statues and Paintings in this Church. I was particularly pleased with *Dante's* Picture done by *Andr. Orgagna*; he is reading, and walking in the Fields by his own House, a View of *Florence* at a distance; extremely well preserv'd, and of a lively Colouring. I believe this is the most Authentic Portrait of that Poet, and has entirely the same Face as the Drawing my Father has.' (pp. 42–3.)

Richardson's somewhat fanciful description of this picture must have been written either from memory, or after a hasty inspection; but in spite of his inaccuracies of detail there can be no doubt as to the identity of the picture seen by him with that now over the north door of the Duomo. An interesting account of Domenico's painting

(which was executed in 1466), and of how he came to be entrusted with the commission, will be found in Mr Holbrook's *Portraits of Dante* already referred to.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

BURNHAM, BUCKS.

LESSING'S 'NATHAN DER WEISE,' ACT I, SC. II.

In my edition of *Nathan der Weise* (Cambridge: University Press, 1912) I failed to offer a satisfactory explanation of the introduction of the somewhat irrelevant episode in the exposition of the play, where Recha is rebuked by Nathan for her 'Schwärmerei' (see pp. xli and 190). I think, however, some light might be thrown on its provenance by a comparison with a favourite theme of Wieland's. The object of that writer's first novel, *Don Sylvio von Rosalva, oder der Sieg der Natur über die Schwärmerey,* is to show how a young 'Schwärmer' who believes in fairies, is cured by a douche of reality. Similarly Agathon, in Wieland's second novel, is cured of his 'Schwärmerei' by the epicurean wisdom of Hippias. Different as the situation is, the 'Schwärmerei' from which Agathon suffers, is clearly analogous to Recha's. His memories 'wiegten seine Sinne in eine Art von leichtem Schlummer ein, worin die innerlichen Kräfte der Seele mit verdoppelter Stärke wirken. Dann bildeten sich ihm die reitzenden Aussichten einer bessern Zukunft vor; er sah alle seine Wünsche erfühlt, er fühlte sich etliche Augenblicke glücklich...' (II Buch, 4 Kap.). In the following chapter Hippias says to Agathon: 'Deine Seele schwebt in einer immer währenden Bezauberung, in einer steten Abwechselung von quälenden und entzückenden Träumen; und die wahre Beschaffenheit der Dinge bleibt dir so verborgen, als die sichtbare Gestalt der Welt einem Blindgebornen.' And later (III Buch, 1 Kap.): 'Dein Übel entspringt von einer Einbildungskraft, welche dir ihre Geschöpfe in einem überirdischen Glanze zeigt, der dein Herz verblendet, und ein falsches Licht über das was wirklich ist, ausbreitet...' 'Was soll man mit einem Menschen anfangen, der Geister sieht?'

Archytas returns to the matter in the third chapter of the last book of the novel: 'Die Schwärmerey,' he says, 'möchte sich über die Gränzen der Natur wegschwingen, sich durch Überspannung ihres innern Sinnes schon in diesem Leben in einen Zustand versetzen können, der uns vielleicht in einen andern bevorsteht; sie nimmt Träume für Erscheinungen, Schattenbilder für Wesen, Wünsche eine

glühenden Phantasie für Genuss; gewöhnt ihr Auge an ein magisches Helldunkel, worin ihm das volle Licht der Vernunft nach und nach unerträglich wird, und berauscht sich in süssen Gefühlen und Ahnungen, die ihr den wahren Zweck des Lebens aus den Augen rücken, die Thätigkeit des Geistes einschläfern, und das unbewachte Herz wehrlos jedem unvermutheten Anfall auf seine Unschuld Preis geben. Gegen diese Krankheit der Seele ist Erfüllung unsrer Pflichten im bürgerlichen und häuslichen Leben das sicherste Verwahrungsmittel; denn innerhalb dieser Schranken ist die Laufbahn eingeschlossen, die uns hienieden angewiesen ist, und es ist blosse Selbsttäuschung, wann jemand sich berufen glaubt, eine Ausnahme von diesem allgemeinen Gesetze zu seyn.' 'Hippias der Weise' is no 'Nathan der Weise'; but it is possible that Archytas suggested some traits for Nathan. Another parallelism is to be seen in the fact that Archytas adopts Agathon's 'Jugendgeliebte' Psyche, who, like Recha in the play, turns out to be the hero's sister (XIII Buch, 2 Kap.).

One more point: Wieland more than once contrasts in *Agathon* (see especially II, 5; IX, 7; XVI, 1) 'Kopf' and 'Herz,' and insists on the need of their being brought into harmony. Cp. Lessing's lines in *Nathan*, 133 ff.

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF GOETHE'S 'CLAVIGO.'

Goedeke (IV, III, § 237 (2)) mentions the following English translations of Goethe's *Clavigo*: (1) by Benj. Thompson (London), 1798, (2) in the *Literary World* (Boston) in 1847, (3) by the members of the Manchester Goethe Society, 1897, (4) by H. Boyesen, 1885, and (5) in Bohn's *Library*, 1884–90.

The *Monthly Magazine*, Vol. XVIII, 1834 (London), contains (pp. 317—327 and 437—450) a complete translation, which appears to have escaped notice hitherto. In point of chronology it is therefore the second of the English translations. It is signed 'A. T.'

A note explains the circumstances under which the translation arose: 'In a review of Goethe's Posthumous Works in the last Foreign Quarterly, it is stated that Goethe, at the request of a lady, dramatized the story of "Clavigo" in eight days. However short the time of producing this tragedy, it is a great favourite with us, and we think quite worthy of the genius of the great Poet of Germany. We are

not aware that any translation has hitherto been given to the public. The story has been told—and powerfully and beautifully told—on canvas, by that youthful genius, Theodor von Holst, and appeared at the last exhibition of the Royal Academy. We confess that it was this exquisite picture which induced us to offer to our readers the present translation.'

The translation is fairly literal and, in the main, correct. It reads quite fluently, without much pretence to style. An extract from Act V (W. A., XI, pp. 118—120) will shew its nature:

Clavigo *enters, enveloped in a cloak, with a sword under his arm. A servant going before, bearing a torch.*

Clav. I told you to avoid this street.

Serv. We should have been obliged to go a great way round, and you are in such haste. It is not far from here that Don Carlos waits.

Clav. Torches yonder!

Serv. A funeral. Come, Sir.

Clav. Maria's house! A funeral! My blood curdles with horror. Go, inquire whom they are going to bury.

Serv. (*Goes up to the men.*) Whom are you going to bury?

Men. Maria Beaumarchais.

(Clavigo *sits on a stone and covers his face.*)

Serv. (*Returning.*) They are going to bury Maria Beaumarchais.

Clav. (*Springing up.*) Must thou echo it, betrayer! Echo the harrowing word that dries up the very marrow in thy bones!

Serv. Be calm, Sir—come. Think of the danger you are in.

Clav. Go to hell! I will not stir hence.

Serv. O Carlos! O that I could find you, Carlos! He has lost his senses. (*Exit.*)

Clav. (*Mutes in the distance.*) Dead! Maria dead! Torches yonder! Her mourning attendants!—'Tis an illusion—a vision that affrights me—that holds a glass before me—wherein I may see by anticipation the end of my treachery. Still there is time! Still!—I tremble—my heart melts with horror! No! no! thou shalt not die. I come! I come!—Vanish, spectres of night—terrific objects who interrupt my passage.—(*Goes up to them distractedly.*) Vanish!—They stand! Ha! They gaze upon me! Woe! woe is me! They are men like myself. It is true—True?—Canst thou conceive it?—She is dead—the feeling seizes me with all the horrors of night; she is dead! There she lies, flowers at thy feet—and thou—have mercy on me, oh my God!—I did not kill her!—Hide yourselves, ye stars, shine not down here, ye who so often saw the criminal quit this threshold with sensations of the most exquisite happiness—even though this street saw him with lute and voice making the air resound to golden phantasies, and kindling his listening maid at her secret lattice with blissful hopes!—And thou now fillest the house with lamentations and grief! and this scene of thy happiness with a funeral dirge!

The translator's knowledge of German, or possibly his accuracy, is not unimpeachable, as a few of his mistranslations will shew: 'ich griff nach meinem Dolche und nahm Gift zu mir und verkleidete mich' (W. A. 56; 11)—'grew envenomed'; 'wenn nur einer auftritt, dessen

Umstände ihm völlige Freiheit lassen, all seiner Entschlossenheit zu folgen' (W. A. 59; 5—6)—'if but one steps forth to countenance our pursuit, it acts as an incentive to our resolution'; 'er biete sie auf, ihm zu schaden' (W. A. 68; 17)—'he warned them how they injured him'; 'und hat man Ihnen nicht vergeben, wie ich denn hoffe' (W. A. 75; 20)—'if they have not forgiven you to my satisfaction'; 'spare deinen Humor auf meine Hochzeit' (W. A. 80; 26)—'spare your wit about my marrying'; 'eine traurige Musik tönt einige Laute von innen' (W. A. 120; 13)—'solemn music sounds from lutes within.'

HERBERT SMITH.

GLASGOW.

THE O.E. NAME FOR THE LETTER G.

In his discussion of the O.E. alphabetic name for the letter G (*Modern Language Review*, October, 1912) Dr H. Bradley says (p. 520), 'I do not know that we have any information as to the names by which the Roman letters were called in England before the Norman Conquest.' But in Ælfric's Latin Grammar (A.D. 995—according to Wülker), under the heading *De Littera*, the names of the twenty-three letters of the Latin alphabet are all clearly given, and no doubt the same names would be used for these letters in any other alphabet in which they were found. 'The five letters *a, e, i, o, u*,' says Ælfric, 'name themselves' (*ðās fīf stafas cætēowjaþ heora naman þurh hī sylfe*). 'The names of the six letters *f, l, m, n, r, s* begin with the letter *e* and end in themselves' (*þā syx ongynnaþ of ðām stæfe* e *and geendjaþ on him sylfum*): '*x* alone begins with the letter *i*' (x *āna ongynð of þām stæfe* i): '*b, c, d, g, h, k, p, q, t* begin with themselves and end in vowels' (*on ðām clypjendlīcum stafum*): '*b, c, d, g, p, t* end in *e*' (*geendjaþ on* e): '*h* and *k* end in *a*, properly' (*æfter rihte*): '*q* ends in *u*': '*z* also, the Greek letter, ends in *a*' (z *ēac, se grēcisca stæf, geendaþ on* a).

Mr Bradley's conjecture that 'the alphabetic name of G would be *gē*' is thus confirmed.

My quotations are taken from Zupitza's edition of the Grammar, *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*, Berlin, 1880; but I have substituted the now more familiar mark for length in O.E. printed texts for Zupitza's circumflex.

JOHN LAWRENCE.

TOKIO

REVIEWS.

The Heroic Age. By H. Munro Chadwick. Cambridge: University Press. 1912. 8vo. xi + 474 pp.

There are few scholars competent to review a work of such wide scope and deep learning as Professor Chadwick's study of the Heroic Age as revealed in the heroic poetry of the Greek and Teutonic peoples, and the present writer must at the outset express his consciousness of his own limitations in dealing with a work of this kind. He can only attempt to do so by confining himself as far as possible to those parts of the book with the subject-matter of which he can claim most acquaintance.

The author himself indicates the natural divisions into which his work falls, the first part dealing with Teutonic, the second with Greek heroic poetry, and the third calling attention to the numerous characteristics common to these two groups of poems and making an attempt to account for them as 'due primarily to resemblances in the ages to which they relate and to which they ultimately owe their origin.'

In the first part Mr Chadwick shows that the cycles of story common to the various Teutonic peoples can, on the evidence of the identity of many of the characters with well-known historical figures, be assigned to a fairly definite period, viz. from about the middle of the third to the middle of the sixth century, a period it is to be noted which coincides almost exactly with that commonly known as the *Völkerwanderungszeit.* In discussing the scene and nationality of the various stories he shows that, while the characters are drawn almost entirely from the Teutonic world, there is no voicing of the interests of any particular nation or tribe. Within the limits of the Teutonic world their tone is international rather than national. Internationalism in literature, it may be remarked, is not an invention of the nineteenth or twentieth century.

In discussing the date of composition of *Beowulf* full consideration is given to two points the value of which is often either neglected or wrongly assessed. The first is the date at which the story could have become known in England. From the end of the sixth to the end of the eighth century there is no evidence for intercourse between England and the Scandinavian lands, where the story must undoubtedly have originated. The stories were certainly known in England before

the end of the eighth century, and they must therefore have been embodied in narratives of more or less fixed form before 600 A.D. The second is the bearing of the Christian element on the date of the poem. This is a problem which has often been discussed, but it seems to the present writer that Mr Chadwick has first rightly stated the position, when he points out that, 'though the poem abounds in Christian sentiment, yet the customs and ceremonies to which it alludes are uniformly heathen.' We are forced to admit that 'though the poem has undergone a fairly thorough revision in early Christian times, it must in the main have been in existence some time before the conversion.'

Beowulf and the heroic poetry of the Teutonic nations in general would seem to have developed within the heroic age itself, and its development was largely due to the prevalence of court-minstrelsy. These minstrels composed the lays of the heroic age itself, celebrating the praises and exploits of their patrons, and then came the composers of the epic and narrative poems based on these. They were followed by popular minstrels who dealt with characters belonging to former times in ballads such as those which lie at the back of Saxo's history, and finally we have poets of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such as the authors of the *Nibelungenlied*, who treat the old stories in a new form.

Finally Professor Chadwick discusses the supernatural, mythical and fictional elements in the heroic poems. In dealing with the supernatural element the most important point made is that 'the presence of supernatural elements does not necessarily mean that the stories in which they occur were composed or modified long after the events which they relate.' For the medieval mind there was not the same definite division between natural and supernatural which the majority of present-day folk are accustomed to draw, and in medieval times we have more than one well authenticated contemporary narrative which can be adduced for the occurrence of what we should call supernatural events. In dealing with the mythical element Mr Chadwick is completely opposed to the early and many of the later interpreters of the heroic poems. He believes that the original stories dealt for the most part with characters who are essentially human, and that the supposed traces of myth are as a rule due to later accretions to the story.

Chapters IX to XIV on the heroic age of Greece and the Homeric poems follow the same lines of development as those of the first eight chapters, and here light is again and again thrown on Homeric problems by reference to the Teutonic poems. Probably the most suggestive passages in the whole book are those in which the results of a study of Teutonic Heroic poetry are used as a touchstone for the truth or falsity of the theories which have been offered in solution of the problems of Homeric poetry. No discussion of these problems can be attempted here. Suffice it to point out the great services which Teutonic poetry can render in this direction. In

Greece the heroic age passed away long before the date of the earliest historical documents, so that, however much we may be convinced of the historic truth of large portions of the Homeric poems, we have no evidence which can enable us with certainty to pronounce any single person or event to be historical, while in the case of the Teutonic age we have the works of several more or less contemporary Roman writers, which enable us to identify many of the characters and incidents. If there is any value in the comparative method of literary or historical study, the fuller evidence for the later age should be of the highest importance in enabling us rightly to understand the earlier and darker age.

Chapters XV to XIX deal with the general characteristics of heroic poetry and the heroic age. The two groups have of course many features of language in common—common epithets, common epic formulae; there is evidence of common religious conceptions, and many of the motives are common to the two groups—thirst for fame, love of boasting, pride of family, faithfulness of followers to their prince. There is plenty of patriotism—love of home and zeal for its defence—but little or no national pride. Individuals rather than nations gather glory to themselves and the chief motives of action are individual rather than national—personal love, revenge or ambition. These chapters are among the most readable in the book, but they can hardly be discussed here, dealing as they do with matters historical, archaeological and ethnological rather than with literature or language. They serve, however, to point a very definite moral to those who are engaged in the teaching of Old English, viz. that if the study of Old English heroic poetry is really to become a valuable instrument of general education, it must get out of the narrow grooves of philological and literary speculation in which it too often inclines to run, and get on to those broader lines which will enable students to realise its importance as picturing a definite stage of human culture and having the closest affinities with the heroic poetry of other peoples and other ages.

A closing word of tribute must be paid to the valuable excursuses with which the volume is enriched. In them Mr Chadwick makes an even wider survey of the problem than he allows himself in the main body of his book, discussing among other things the light thrown on the problem by a study of the Celtic and Slavonic heroic ages, with more special reference to Welsh and Servian heroic poetry. There are few scholars in this age of specialisation who combine width of study, accuracy of knowledge and suggestiveness in idea to so remarkable a degree as the new Professor of Anglo-Saxon at Cambridge. May the present work be a happy omen of a long and fruitful tenure of that office.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Poetry and Prose. Being Essays on Modern English Poetry. By Adolphus Alfred Jack. London: Constable. 1912. 8vo. x + 278 pp.

No less than poetry itself, the problems which concern the nature of poetry, touch the very core of literary study. Yet they are notoriously difficult to capture and probe by recognised literary methods; and without rejecting the claim of critical analysis to be able, in the last resort, to search and map these speculative deeps, one is apt to surmise that a procedure in which there is less of set method than of intuition will have the best chance of success. Current literary discussion, in England, is full of suspicion of theories of literature, as of philosophical 'aesthetics' at large; and no doubt those who have reasoned abstrusely about poetic vision have often been rather conspicuously deficient in it themselves. But the greatest of modern aestheticians, Hegel, was a conspicuous example to the contrary; and in our own time the remarkable union of penetrating insight with luminous reasoning power in the author of the *Oxford Lectures* has brought notably nearer the prospect of a coherent and comprehensive *Poetic*.

With less of sustained illuminating power than he, but with a glancing, versatile brilliance of his own, Mr Jack handles some of these problems in the present series of essays. The titles suggest a more systematic planning out of the field than the book actually presents. Thus Gray stands for 'social or Prose poetry,' Burns for 'Natural or spontaneous poetry,' Wordsworth for 'basic or elemental poetry,' Byron for 'oratorical poetry,' and Emerson, Arnold, and Meredith together for the poetry of the 'intellect.' One might guess from the choice of poets the lines upon which Mr Jack's ideas about the distinction of 'Poetry and Prose' run. That he is not, for instance, one of those who take their stand upon music or metre. Verse-rhythm, verse-music, play a slight and undistinguished part in the discussion, and poets in whom they are very important, such as Swinburne, Coleridge, and the Cavaliers, do not, we gather, greatly interest Mr Jack. 'Trifles, prettiness, a careless shoe-string, dressed-up theology, tricks of phrase,' this is his summary of the doings of the seventeenth century (Milton apart) in poetry, after 'the imaginative revel' of the great age preceding. These are not the haunts of Mr Jack's quarry. What especially arrests and occupies him, in the relation of Poetry and Prose, is the psychological side of the contrast; the distinction between what he calls 'emotional' and 'intellectual' apprehension. Nicety in the use of terms is hardly a strong point with him, and he often seems to imply, what he cannot be supposed to believe, that poetic vision is not a state of transfigured intelligence as well as of heightened emotion. He even speaks (p. 162) of 'emotion' as 'generalising experience.' Much of his discussion suggests a kind of Manichean dualism between emotion and intellect, as seen in their characteristic 'works,' in poetry and prose. And if Mr Jack is no pessimist, but on the contrary a very assured believer in the future of poetry, he is nevertheless much preoccupied with the

snares which the spirit of prose spreads, especially in these latter days, for even good poets; and this book, which in plan suggests a survey of the opportunities for poetry, in substance resembles rather an analysis of the 'temptations' to prose. All his subjects were, in this sense, interesting 'cases'; they all had to wrestle with sin, and their triumphs, however consummate, were in some sense precarious. There is Gray, child of the 'prosaic, intensely English eighteenth century,' in the ban of his *milieu*, and yet, in the Elegy, producing a poem which, definitely poetic only here and there, has as a whole the effect of poetry. There is Burns, so firmly held in the grip of the same prosaic age that Mr Jack actually makes his 'poetry' begin with his twenty-seventh year. There is Wordsworth, glorious adventurer among the hazards of the commonplace, of whose poetry our critic admirably says: 'There is no other which so well explains the nature of poetry, which without leaning in the least to poetising, is so essentially poetical.' There is Byron, ensnared by rhetoric and the consciousness of an audience. But the perils begin in earnest when we come to the 'intellectual' poets, who work in the very stuff which seemed foredoomed to prose, and whose successes are thus veritable brands plucked from the burning. This is the special element of Emerson, perhaps the greatest of all 'intellectual' poets in this sense, if we have regard both to the reluctance of the matter he set his hand to, and to the frequent splendour of the result; and Mr Jack's critical survey is one of the most penetrating discussions of Emerson's poetry yet produced. He notices his curious failure when he had to do with a great poetic subject like love ('Eva'); whereas he can 'poeticalise' gritty things like politics; for example, the working-creed of Liberalism:

> God said, I am tired of kings,
> I suffer them no more;
> Up to my ear the morning brings
> The outrage of the poor.

or Evolution:

> And the poor grass shall plot and plan
> What it will do when it is man.

No doubt the 'poeticalising' of ideas, however completely effected, involves something foreign to that perfect fusion of thought and form signalised by Mr Bradley in the fine sentence quoted by Mr Jack: 'The specific way of imagination is not to clothe in imagery consciously held ideas; it is to produce half consciously a matter from which when produced the reader may, if he chooses, extract ideas.' Is there then no way in which a poet can render imaginatively the current 'ideas' which he 'consciously holds'? Emerson and Meredith and Arnold, not to speak of Lucretius and Dante, may, we think, be held to have shown that Mr Bradley's 'specific' way of imagination is yet not the only way.

But the example of Dante suggests a demur which goes somewhat further,—as to whether the terms of Mr Jack's Manicheanism are quite rightly chosen. Is the 'particularising intellect' so absolute an enemy

of poetry? Or, if it is, in a poetic sense, a *Geist der stets verneint*, are there not poetic natures in which this spirit of negation at least occasionally *gutes schafft*? The scheme of many long poems is sheer intellectual construction. In the *Commedia* this is of the most elaborate and intricate kind. Yet will anyone say that the scheme which provides the ordered scene-succession in the wonderful drama of Dante's three-fold vision is merely obstructive matter overcome? That it does not itself contribute to the poetry, somewhat as, one may dare to suggest, the rigid geometrical scheme of Spinoza is contributory to his 'God-intoxicated' ethics? In Browning, too—whom Mr Jack only incidentally handles—though on a far lower plane, poetry sometimes seems to be captured in alliance with, and not in spite of, the discursive intellect (which often enough, elsewhere, breaks away in gay or boisterous expatiations of its own); as if the meshes of the intellectual apparatus became incandescent in the flame of imaginative emotion and, in spite of their alien origin, increased its power.

Wordsworth—interpreted by Emerson, might be taken not unfairly to indicate the central thoughts about poetry upon which Mr Jack's book converges. Both had the rapt, impassioned intuition; Wordsworth, also, in unequalled degree, the power of conveying emotion with a naked simplicity which seems as it were to get behind language itself. Emerson on the other hand, with no less of ideal vision and an even firmer grip upon earth, had further reaches of explicit thought, and hitched the star to the waggon and the waggon to the star with more definite and palpable cords. It is thus that Emerson can intervene, almost as a *deus ex machina*, in a problem which deeply involves Wordsworth, but upon which Wordsworth himself offers no help: the problem, namely, what is to be made of the Wordsworthian faith in 'Nature,' for which modern science has no respect, and which Arnold sadly dismissed as vain. In a notice of Mr Jack's former book on Shelley, where this view was accepted, the present reviewer ventured to suggest a solution —substantially that of Emerson—which he took to be truer. With only too generous acknowledgments for the hint, Mr Jack now avails himself of Emerson's illuminating defence of the reality, for man, of Nature 'which speaks to us and whose tongue we speak.'

At the same time (and this is our final demur) we think that Emerson's sublime paradoxes occasionally warp our critic's literary perception. In the last essay ('Emerson's doctrine of the Infinite') he presses very hard the idea that Shakespeare brings home the old truths we find in him chiefly 'by contradictions, impossibilities, surprises, by the negation of the probable.' 'The fine harmonies of *The Winter's Tale* are directly due to his making men jealous for no reason, affectionate wives punish repentant husbands for sixteen years, etc.' Surprises are undoubtedly part of the deliberate method of the later comedies, but would they be so effective in bringing home old truths if they were not built upon Shakespeare's unfailing psychological veracity? It is perhaps chiefly a question of emphasis; was the fictitiousness or the veracity the essential thing? And, similarly, we may concur heartily with the

doctrine, warmly espoused and finely expounded by Mr Jack, that poetry is a 'liberation,' without inferring that it necessarily 'says goodbye to limitations' or 'overrides them.' It is a commonplace that a member of a highly organised state may be 'freer' than the inhabitant of a desert island. And if there is any truth in poetic realism, poetry may liberate our souls as effectually by permeating and vivifying the tissues of actuality, as by disturbing and rending them.

C. H. HERFORD.

MANCHESTER.

The Making of Poetry. By A. H. R. FAIRCHILD. New York: Putnams. 1912. 8vo. 263 pp.

The study of æsthetics has always had—and must always have—a peculiar fascination of its own. The gifts of science to mankind are plain and incontrovertible, but the gifts of art are harder to apprise. What is beauty? Of what use is the study of beauty? Why, with nature before our eyes, do we need what must at best be but a faulty copy in picture or poem? These are questions to which the critics of all ages have offered answers, but of which there can never be any completely satisfactory solution. The very poets themselves cannot tell us what poetry is, at best they can but suggest certain of its aspects, or give us some such vague and illuminating definition as Shelley's, 'Poetry is the record of the best and happiest moments of the happiest and best minds,' or Wordsworth's familiar epigram of 'emotion recollected in tranquillity.' But if the quest be foredoomed to failure it is none the less worth undertaking; Childe Roland may fail to achieve the adventure of the Dark Tower, but we should be the poorer if he never attempted it —the poorer, not only by the actual gain of endeavour, but by loss of certain knowledge. Because the *genus homo* is greater than any individual, there is no need to abandon the study of human nature altogether, and the study of æsthetics is neither more nor less than the study of human nature. Professor Fairchild sets out boldly by asking 'Can poetry be defined?' and having decided 'that no finally satisfactory definition of poetry ever can be made,' goes on to examine 'the only part about which definite and precise statements can safely be made...the material and the processes which go to make poetry what it is.' Cordial agreement with Mr Fairchild's conclusion does not, however, necessarily imply entire acquiescence in his chain of reasoning. We are told that poetry cannot be defined because it 'begins and ends in feeling,' and feeling cannot be described in terms of something else and therefore cannot really be described at all. But, as Mr Bertrand Russell shows in his *Problems of Philosophy*, this difficulty confronts us just as much in practical and material matters as in sensation. We cannot accurately define a feeling, nor can we accurately describe a table. In both cases we 'simplify and systematise our account of our experiences' by using a currency of speech which experience has shown to contain a common denominator of truth. It is not because the final appeal of poetry is to feeling, and

feeling transcends words, that poetry cannot be defined, but because art is universal in the fullest sense of the word, and no hands but those of the gods can gather together all the scattered fragments which make the perfect image of Truth, no language but that of Olympus can fully express her message. But if Mr Fairchild dismisses poetry itself somewhat cursorily, he deals in greater detail with his subdivisions: (1) What is the material out of which poetry is made? (2) What are the chief processes or kinds of activity involved in the making of it? (3) What, from this point of view, is the real nature of poetry? (4) What is the need, and what is the value of poetry? All criticism of any merit provokes contradiction, but while we wince at the suggestion that in the lines,

> I would that my tongue could utter
> The thoughts that arise in me,

Tennyson 'might better have said "feelings,"' and grow impatient of the matter-of-fact interpretation of 'brief candle'—'What really justifies the term "brief" is the parallelism between Macbeth's life, as he now sees it, and a candle. Neither lasts for long; each implies a limit of time; both are about to go "out"'—much of Mr Fairchild's careful and thoughtful treatment of individual epithets is stimulating and suggestive. Now and then it is difficult to see the full force of his reasoning. He lays great stress, for instance, on the unpoetic nature of utility, and declares that to him a vine is less beautiful than a spray of honeysuckle (the idea of honey being presumably too remote to be intrusive). This is a matter of personal idiosyncrasy, and while it may surprise the reader, calls for no comment, but when he goes on (p. 58) to enumerate nearly fifty images employed by Wordsworth in the *Reverie of Poor Susan*, and adds 'only two, meadow and pail, can even suggest use or service,' we are left in perplexity. 'Trees, however beautiful, are for lumber and fuel...waterfalls, however magnificent, for power and light' (p. 50), and yet these same trees suggest neither use nor service—to say nothing of cottage, river, hill, stream, eyes, all of which are included in his unutilitarian list. As a matter of fact the contention that images are poetic in proportion as they are removed from all idea of the service of man will not hold water for an instant. What of that 'brief candle,' the poetic nature of which Mr Fairchild has been at considerable pains to explain? Finally a protest must be entered against the constant use of the detestable verb to 'personalise' which even its inventor confesses 'is not attractive.' In the coining of words, more perhaps than in anything else, success, and nothing but success, proves justification. 'Personalise' cannot be called a success.

But, with all its faults, the book is one likely to be of real use to students of literature. It is not profound, but it draws attention to many points which are likely to escape the attention of the inexperienced reader, and its whole attitude towards poetry is eminently sane and healthy. Chapter VII, which deals with the Need and Value of Poetry, is particularly good. Nothing is easier than to drift into sentimental generalities on such a subject, but the author does good service in

insisting on the disciplinary and logical character of poetry. 'It has a logic as severe as that of science, a logic more difficult and more subtle because it is based on more elusive conditions...Poetry, in very truth, is a supplement to everyday life of the most intensely practical character ...it knits together (life's) scattered and disparate bits of experience in a revealing way; it organises life afresh, and on a higher plane than that upon which we commonly live.' There is nothing new in all this, but it is put with vigour and conviction, and, after all, the value of criticism lies less in saying something new than in bringing home to us truths with which we ought to be, but are not, familiar. The section on Primitive Poetry contains some interesting suggestions, though perhaps it scarcely discriminates sufficiently between different degrees of poetic sensitiveness in different races. But, of necessity, these remarks are very condensed, and the point which Mr Fairchild makes, if not the only one possible, has a value of its own. His study of poetry as a whole is calculated to stimulate thought and set the reader investigating for himself, and the work which achieves this, fulfils the chief purpose of criticism by compelling us to set up and defend our own standard of right judgment.

GRACE E. HADOW.

CIRENCESTER.

The Middle English Penitential Lyric. By F. A. PATTERSON. New York: Columbia University Press. 1911. 8vo. ix + 203 pp.

A more appropriate title for this book would have been 'The Middle English Devotional Lyric,' for Dr Patterson has extended its limits to include many pieces not definitely penitential, such as the translation of 'Veni Creator Spiritus' (No. 44), the prayer 'To þe gude angell' (No. 46), 'A Morning Thanksgiving and Prayer to God' (No. 48), and, indeed, with few exceptions the whole latter half of the material which he has assembled. In the case of some of these pieces—as, for example, the 'Pater Noster in Anglico (!)'—even the lyrical quality is difficult to perceive. Nor do all of them show that unity of emotion which Mr Patterson accepts as the true test of the lyric (p. 2). For example, 'A Confessioun to Ihesu Crist' (No. 4) is separable into three distinct poems: (1) a prayer to Christ, (2) a prayer to Our Lady, (3) a prayer to angels, saints, etc.

In his Introduction Mr Patterson severely criticises a classification of religious lyrics 'by means of external—almost accidental—names, such as *Prayers to God, to Christ* and *to the Virgin Mary*' for the reason that 'the unity of the lyric is not expressed by a title chosen from some convenient external feature of the poem' (p. 2). To group various prayers to the Virgin, as German scholars have done, under the heading *Mariengebete*, is to his mind particularly objectionable, 'as a prayer to Mary may express any one of many religious emotions,—it may be a prayer of confession, a supplication for mercy, an avowal of reformation, or an expression of mystic love-longing. In fact, a title

more artificial and meaningless would be hard to find' (p. 3). Nevertheless, the tabular classification which he adopts for his lyrics follows much the same system:

'B. *Poems expressing contrition.*

a. Sorrow for Sin.

. . . .

II. Non-Liturgical.

a. Prayers to the Deity.

b. Poems to the Virgin Mary.

c. Timor Mortis Poems.

β. Prayers to Be Kept from Sin, and for Aid.

I. Liturgical.

II. Non-Liturgical.

a. Resolves to Reform.

b. General Prayers to the Deity for Protection from Sin.

c. Prayers to Christ.

d. Prayers to the Virgin Mary.' (pp. 13—15.)

Moreover, the Prayers included under the last subdivision present a variety of religious emotion almost as wide as that in the collections of *Mariengebete.*

The value of Mr Patterson's monograph would have been increased by limiting it more strictly to the field of penitential verse, and by bringing together a more comprehensive collection of lyrics within that field. The two paraphrases of the Pater Noster (Nos. 39 and 40), for example, might have been omitted, but one is surprised not to find Maydestone's version of the Fifty-first Psalm, 'Mercy God of my misdede.' Other important omissions might be cited, but it is clear that Mr Patterson has undertaken to present specimens rather than an exhaustive collection.

The texts included in the volume are for the most part reprinted from the Early English Text Society and other printed collections, only six of the sixty-nine pieces being printed directly from manuscript sources. The references added in the Notes to versions in other manuscripts might have been considerably extended. For example, No. 4 is found also in Harl. MS. 210 and Camb. MSS. Ii. 6. 43, Dd. 14. 26, Dd. 8. 2. No. 21, of which it is stated there are 'no variants,' occurs in Harl. MSS. 116 and 2225 and in Ashmol. MS. 59. Under No. 25 reference might also have been made to the closely related 'Orison to þe trinite' (in 12-line stanzas) which is inserted in three MSS. of the *Cursor Mundi* (E.E.T.S. pp. 1454—1459). No. 26 occurs also in B.M. Addit. MS. 31042. Very similar to No. 32 is the Song to the Virgin in Ashmol. MS. 1393, as noted by Chambers and Sidgwick, p. 346. No. 39 occurs

also in the Auchinleck MS., from which it was printed by Kölbing in *Engl. Stud.* IX, 44. No. 52—Richard de Caistre's Hymn—was printed from ten MSS. by Mr Dundas Harford in the *Proceedings of the Norfolk and Norwich Archaeol. Soc.* XVII, 221—244. Five more manuscript copies of the same poem are known to me and even these probably do not exhaust the list. No. 67 occurs also in Royal MS. 17. A. xxvii. Nos. 11, 42, and 44, by a strange slip are ascribed to 'Porkington MS. No. 10,' but are actually taken from Phillipps MS. 8336.

A comparison of Mr Patterson's texts with his printed sources affords gratifying evidence of typographical accuracy. With regard to the texts printed for the first time, one may note that a collation of the *Deus in Nomine Tuo Saluum Me Fac* (No. 21) with the text of this poem printed independently by MacCracken[1] from the same manuscript reveals a series of discrepancies which is disquieting. In 35 cases Patterson prints a final *e* which is lacking in MacCracken's text. Other variations are as follows:

Ll.	*Patterson.*	*MacCracken.*
3	sarch	serch
6	ay &	ax y
15	Wher	Ther
20	Gramarcy	Gramercy
23	rem*e*mbred	remembred
33	fon	foon
34	dispytt	disp*er*pyll
39	fulfyll*e*	fulfille
45	blessed	blesed
51	day	way
54	Salve	Helpe (cf. footnote)
55	finde oder plite	finde in oder plite
58	thyngis	thyng
64	Luynge	Louynge
66	co*m*mbtable	co*m*mvtable
69	co*n*trite	contrite
70	all*e* lust	all that lust
71	mescheue	myscheue
72	all*e* hut	all myn hirt

A comparison of these readings leads to the conclusion that this poem has been printed with surprising carelessness either in the *Minor Poems* or in the *Middle English Penitential Lyric*; though without collating the manuscript it is of course impossible to determine which editor is responsible.

Many of the errors and omissions to which attention has been directed in this review of Mr Patterson's monograph are trivial. The volume makes a substantial contribution to our knowledge of the Middle English religious lyric by the closer relationship which it establishes between this verse and the Liturgy of the Church and Latin devotional treatises. The discovery that the Orison in the Vernon MS. beginning 'Lord my God al Merciable' is a close translation of a prayer by Thomas Aquinas is especially interesting. On the

[1] *Minor Poems of Lydgate* I, E.E.T.S., Ext. Ser. 107, pp. 10—12.

other hand, Mr Patterson certainly goes to an extreme in declaring that 'Latin hymns and devotional Latin poetry had no appreciable influence upon the development of the Middle English religious lyric' (p. 25). To cite a particular instance, No. 43, for which he failed to find a source, is directly based on the hymn *Ave Maris Stella* in Daniel's *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*, I, 204. Numerous other instances might be cited, especially among the poems addressed to the Virgin, in which the Middle English verses are expansions of Latin hymns.

CARLETON BROWN.

BRYN MAWR, PA., U.S.A.

Early English Classical Tragedies. Edited with Introduction and Notes by JOHN W. CUNLIFFE. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1912. 8vo. c + 352 pp.

Professor Cunliffe is well known by his work on the influence of Seneca on Elizabethan drama, and no one could be more competent than he for the supplementary work he has undertaken in the book before us. He has given us the text of four early plays on the Senecan model—*Gorboduc, Jocasta, Gismond of Salerne* and *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, and has prefixed to them an Introduction in which he traces the history of Tragedy through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance to the close of the sixteenth century. Notes and a Glossary complete the book, the notes on *Gorboduc* being supplied by Dr H. A. Watt.

The Introduction is a most comprehensive and useful treatment of its subject. Its great omission—the only serious fault to be found with the whole book—is that it gives no account of Seneca's plays and their characteristics of structure and content. Such an account would have put the reader in a position to appreciate the various indications of a return to Seneca seen in Renaissance writers. As it is, an acquaintance with Senecan Tragedy is taken for granted, or left to be deduced by the reader from incidental references made in connexion with later writers.

Professor Cunliffe shows very lucidly how in the Middle Ages the very idea of tragedy as a dramatic form of art faded from knowledge, how it came to be thought that a play was recited by a single speaker, while one or more actors accompanied him in dumb show. (Incidentally he shows the long persistence of a curious error which turned one Calliopius, the scribe of a MS. of Terence, into the poet's friend who recited his plays.) One might think that this view of the manner in which ancient drama was given, might have had some effect in causing the introduction of *intermedii* into the representations of Italian renaissance plays. It hardly appears however from Professor Cunliffe's account that there is ground for assuming such a connexion: though it does seem clear that the Italian *intermedii*, as Professor Cunliffe argues, led to the English Dumb-shows. (It may be noticed that Mr Watt in his note on p. 298 is on this point not in agreement with

Professor Cunliffe, and considers that Dumb-shows are derived from a native source—'the allegorical "tableaux" or stands which were a regular accompaniment of city pageants and court masques.')

The Introduction throws a good deal of light on the method of staging by 'houses' derived, as Professor Cunliffe says, from the *sacre rappresentazioni*. Was not *Gorboduc* so staged? and should not this be remembered in connexion with Mr Watts' note on p. 299:—'It will be noted that no stage directions of any kind are given. These will be inserted wherever necessary in the notes. The opening scene of the tragedy takes place in a room in Gorboduc's palace.' That staging by 'houses' was in common use in English University plays is seen by the direction prefixed to Abraham Fraunce's *Victoria*:—'Quatuor extruendæ sunt domus, nimirum Fidelis 1ª, Fortunij 2ª, Cornelij 3ª, Octauiani 4ª. Quin et sacellum quoddam erigendum est, etc.'

Other points of interest which are treated in the Introduction are the contending influences of Greek and Roman tragedy in Italy in the Renaissance period, and the influence of the study of Vitruvius and the architectural remains of antiquity in bringing about a truer conception of the nature of classical drama. The political motive in *Gorboduc*, especially in Norton's part of the tragedy, is well brought out.

On p. xlv, l. 4 from bottom, 'Halcyone' should be 'Halcyonę' ('Halcyonæ').

On p. lxxx 'John Knox's *Christ Triumphant*' should be 'John Foxe's.'

On p. lxxxvi. It is rather curious that though *Gismond of Salerne* was acted at the Inner Temple in $156\frac{7}{8}$, the authors, all, as Professor Cunliffe says, presumably members of the Inn, were all of them men in middle life. At any rate none of them, 'Rod. Straf[ford?], Hen[ry] No[el], G. Al., Ch[ristopher] Hat[ton], R[obert] W[ilmot]' can be identified in the Admission Lists of the Inn which begin in 1546. One would expect that a new form of literary enterprise would have been taken in hand by men of thirty or under.

On p. cxix. Professor Cunliffe says that Legge's *Richardus Tertius* was 'acted at St John's College, Cambridge in 1573, and apparently repeated in 1579 and 1582.' The play was acted in $157\frac{9}{80}$. In a previous volume of this *Review* (III, p. 141) I discussed the date 1582 and came to the conclusion that it might be disregarded. I know no evidence for a first representation in 1573.

On p. 31 should not the comma after l. 9 and the full-stop after l. 10 be interchanged?

On p. 306 Mr Watt says 'It is not clear why the Duke of Albany should be here [*Gorboduc* v. 2, 120] referred to as a foreign prince.' But Holinshed's *Chronicle* (1577) I fo. 39ᵇ shows that Albany lay chiefly in Scotland.

The authors of *Gismond of Salerne* and of *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, especially the latter, drew very largely on Seneca, as is well shown in the editorial notes. It has not however been shown that Hughes is under obligations to Lucan also, and I am therefore greatly

obliged to my colleague Professor W. C. Summers, who made the discovery, for allowing me to print here his valuable note on the point.

In *Arthur*, Act iv, Scene 2, where the Senecan influence is very slight, Hughes is inspired by Lucan. It is known that Garnier got from the seventh book of the *Pharsalia* some ideas for the battle of Thapsus in *Cornélie* (cp. especially *Corn.* 1727 *sqq.* with *Phars.* 557 *sqq.*). But the description of the battle between Arthur and Mordred is little more than amplification of Lucan's. We have all the essentials reproduced: the clamour for the signal, portents and heavy rains, the hesitation of a usually confident general, the reference to the various nations fighting with each army and warring each in its own peculiar way, orders given to soldiers to spare the mean and slay the noble, the refusal of the poet to follow out every detail of the fray, and so forth—not without occasional misunderstandings of the difficult original. I notice by the way in this same battle-scene at least three loans from other books of the *Pharsalia*.

Dr Cunliffe's book is a valuable supplement to Mr Warwick Bond's *Early Plays from the Italian* and may be warmly recommended to students of the Elizabethan drama.

G. C. Moore Smith.

The Authorship of the Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI. By C. F. Tucker Brooke (Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences). New Haven: Yale University Press. 1912. 8vo. 67 pp. (145—211).

The purpose of Mr Tucker Brooke's paper is to prove that Marlowe was the sole author of the *Contention* and *True Tragedy*, that Shakspere alone altered these two plays into the pieces called *The Second* and *The Third Part of Henry the Sixt* in the 1623 folio, and that the Shaksperian versions are very much inferior to their Marlowe originals. Mr Tucker Brooke also believes that the text upon which Shakspere worked was fuller and less corrupt than that of the Millington quartos, so that 'the 1623 version of the plays, besides including for the first time the alterations of Shakespeare, also represented a purer and more complete copy of the Marlovian work.' This view denies to Shakspere any hand in the *Contention* or the *True Tragedy*, refuses to admit collaboration by Greene, Peele, or any other dramatist with either Marlowe or Shakspere, and so contravenes, in various degrees, the opinions of Halliwell-Phillips, Furnivall, Fleay and Miss Jane Lee.

The essay is a *Tendenzschrift*, written by a devotee of Marlowe to the greater glory of his master. This fact does not deprive it of critical value: on the contrary, it has inspired the writer to the laborious collection of excellent objective evidence, while the interpretative power of sympathy has sharpened his insight into Marlowe's character, and Marlowe's way of regarding life and men. But it leads him into dealing somewhat cavalierly with Shakspere, whenever he can be looked on as a rival to Marlowe, and with any and every critic whom Mr Tucker Brooke suspects of a deficient adoration at the shrine of Christopher. Mr Halliwell-Phillips, in setting up the hypothesis which alone (in my

view) takes account of all the facts, was, it seems, 'inspired by the pious desire of the Shakespeare-worshipper to ascribe to his idol whatever might be of particular merit in the work, while relieving him of all responsibility for the mediocre portions.' Shakspere himself had the audacity to expand a speech of York in the first scene of 2 *Henry VI*, in order, as it strikes a plain man, to make the soliloquy more natural, and less like a confidence across the footlights. Mr Tucker Brooke holds, however, that 'Shakespeare was impelled not by the desire of voicing more truly the real character of York, but merely by the ambition of the young poet to express a couple of pretty notions.' In Act II, Scene iv, again, Shakspere is guilty of 'bad art and bad psychology' in making Humphrey cast a thought on 'so trifling a detail' as that the flints of the street were wounding his wife's feet. In other passages Shakspere's work exhibits 'bad taste,' 'pure bombast,' 'hollow declamation,' 'meaningless rant.' Much of Mr Tucker Brooke's invective is beside the point—as when he imputes the insolence of Shakspere's Iden to Shakspere himself—and the rest is, to say the least, overstated.

Mr Tucker Brooke succeeds in demonstrating (what, indeed, is hardly disputed) that Marlowe had a chief hand (the essayist would rather say, the sole hand) in the *Contention* and the *True Tragedy*. After a comparison of these plays with Marlowe's undoubted work in respect of plot and of character (pp. 152—160, two admirable sections), he considers the verbal parallels between these two plays and the accepted plays of Marlowe, and, making ingenious use of Marlowe's habit of repeating himself, he heaps up evidence which there is no withstanding. A section on metrical evidence, which follows, shows that as regards pyrrhic fifth feet, eleven-syllable lines and run-on lines the *Contention* and *True Tragedy* behave, on the whole, like Marlowe's work. I have myself tested this result by comparing the first thousand lines in Mr Tucker Brooke's edition of *Edward II* with the first act of the *Contention*, and I find that the proportion of seven-syllable fore-lines with a marked pause is about 2 per cent. in each case: this is lower than the lowest ratio in any Shaksperian play, and lower even than the composite *Shrew* (2·9 per cent.). The indices for 2 and 3 *Henry VI* are 3·6 and 3·7. (This result does not exclude the possibility that Shakspere may have touched the *Contention* and the *True Tragedy*, but it shows that his part in them must have been small.)

Mr Tucker Brooke's table on p. 181 assigns to the *True Tragedy* 7 per cent. of eleven-syllable lines. No accepted play of Marlowe shown in this table has more than 4·3 per cent. This seems to suggest that a second hand, besides that of Marlowe, had worked on this play. But the essayist himself fails to notice this point. Later on he writes that Greene's allusion to the 'Tygers heart' seems to have pertinence 'only if we assume Shakspere's revision of the play in question already to have been made.' Surely we may go further and say that Greene's parody of a particular line cannot imply that Shakspere was related in any way to any play, unless Greene regarded it as a line written

by Shakspere. But it occurs already in the *True Tragedy*. Unless, then, we are to convict Greene of a curious blunder, Shakspere had worked—however slightly—on the *True Tragedy*, and some of his work appears in the quarto versions. But this, added to Mr Tucker Brooke's own contention that much of Marlowe's work was omitted in these imperfect copies, and appeared for the first time in the 1623 folio, amounts exactly to the Halliwell-Phillips hypothesis which Mr Tucker Brooke so contemptuously rejects: namely 'that the original plays upon which 2 and 3 *Henry VI* were based have been lost, and that the *Contention* and *True Tragedy* included the first additions which Shakespeare made to the originals.'

We may agree with Mr Tucker Brooke that the evidence for any collaboration of Greene or Peele in the quarto plays is extremely slight and indirect; but he does not consider the rather striking internal evidence that *some* writer was engaged on them, besides Marlowe (and, if we are to say so, Shakspere), before they reached the state in which the folio presents them.

E. W. Lummis.

Cambridge.

The Winter's Tale. Edited by F. W. Moorman. (*The Works of Shakespeare*, Arden Edition.) London: Methuen. 1912. 8vo. xxxiii + 125 pp.

This volume worthily maintains the reputation of the Arden Edition. The text of the first Folio has been followed with as little variation as possible: divergences from this have been recorded in footnotes, while alterations suggested by previous editors receive attention in the general notes when their importance is sufficient to justify it. Professor Moorman's work in this respect is most praiseworthy; if he has erred at all, it is on the right side, and occasional instances of rather too much regard for the punctuation of the first Folio may be readily condoned. The introduction offers many points of interest. Mr Moorman's acute critical sense, which was so happily displayed in his study of Herrick, does not desert him here. *The Winter's Tale* teems with questions interesting to the student and critic. The relation the play bears to the source, the topical satire and the country festival scenes, the form and construction of the play and its place not only in Shakespeare's work, but as an extraordinarily interesting milestone in the long and tortuous road followed by the Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, all claim attention. Naturally the scope of the editor is limited, and Mr Moorman can only touch lightly on some of these questions. He refers twice to Professor Thorndike's work on the influence of Beaumont and Fletcher upon Shakespeare, and on each occasion with good judgement, particularly in the last portion of his Introduction, where he spiritedly and successfully shows that Hermione was not the mere creature of situations, but a Shakespearean character. We are very grateful for insistence on this point, for there is a tendency

in some quarters towards rash and uncritical generalisations in the history of the Jacobean drama, in which hawks and handsaws are not infrequently confused. Shakespeare's artistic sense never allowed him to subordinate character and truth to the surprise element in plot; the increased intricacy and complication of story in his later plays is not a mere spasmodic change, but may be found to some extent in the later tragedies. Mr Moorman is not quite convincing on Leontes and disposes of him rather too hastily. As a study of jealousy ingrained in a character Leontes is worthy of a high place: he stands far above nearly all other treatments of this theme, which was so attractive to the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatist. The companion picture to Leontes in Shakespeare is Master Ford, where the comic potentialities of the character are realised: but throughout the Jacobean drama the tragic effects caused by the character as well as the possibilities of something near tragedy in the character itself, are exploited in an almost bewildering variety of ways. Ford's Bassanes is an instance of the former and Massinger's Leosthenes is a good example of the other.

In his treatment of the source Mr Moorman is very fairly complete, and gives a capital comparison of Shakespeare's work with that of Greene in his *Pandosto* and of Sabie in the *Fisherman's Tale*. He tells us that Autolycus is entirely Shakespeare's own creation. He might have pointed out that the genesis of the character may be found in Greene's little portrait of Capnio, where the relation that Autolycus bears to the actual plot is indicated. It forms a good instance of Shakespeare's expansion of character from a mere hint in the original. Another interesting subject dealt with in the Introduction is the treatment of the Oracle motive. Mr Moorman here is brief, but his treatment is pregnant with suggestion, not only as regards its intrinsic importance but in the questions so closely connected with it.

The notes both textual and critical are throughout excellent and leave nothing to be desired. The illustrative quotations are well-chosen, and in this matter the editor shows an admirable restraint. Certain difficulties in the text remain unexplained; but owing to the wealth of detail with which the *Winter's Tale* is embroidered this is of course unavoidable.

F. W. Clarke.

Bangor.

The Cambridge History of English Literature. Edited by A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Vol. viii. The Age of Dryden. Cambridge: University Press. 1912. 8vo. xiv + 515 pp.

This volume of the *Cambridge History of English Literature* suggests in a very definite form the question what ought to count as literature for the purposes of such a history as this, and the answer which it seems to give is probably the right one, namely that the word 'literature' must be taken to include every written, or at least printed, expression of ideas. Thus we have chapters on the 'Early Quakers,'

on the 'Platonists and Latitudinarians,' on 'Legal Literature,' on 'John Locke' and on 'The Progress of Science,' dealing with subjects which have very small connection with literature in its higher sense: but, as we have said, the decision of the editors in this matter is probably judicious. A history of literature carried out on the principle of cooperation will almost necessarily fail in unity of idea, and compensation for this must be sought in the encyclopædic completeness of information which it is possible to provide by enlisting in the undertaking many specialists in various subjects. It is seldom that any single man can be found competent, as Hallam was, to write the history of a great period of literature in an encyclopædic manner. His modestly entitled *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* is a book which shews an extraordinary extent of reading, as well as remarkable soundness of judgment, and with some self-imposed limitations the author covers the whole field in a manner which in this age seems to be thought impossible. It may safely be predicted that men will still from time to time appear who, confident in the essential soundness of their knowledge, will venture to brave criticism on the details of many subjects, and to construct for us a synoptical view of vast fields of literature, which shall bear the impress of a single mind. For ordinary purposes, however, we are in the hands of the students of particular periods or particular authors, and we must make the best of them, as the editors of the *Cambridge History of English Literature* are endeavouring to do.

The volume before us might have been much stronger than it is on the purely literary side, if the editors had so chosen. The question what has become of Milton inevitably arises. This is the period in which his greatest work was produced, *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*, and he is not dealt with at all, except very incidentally in a brief review of the prosody of the seventeenth century. The answer to the question is of course easy. It was convenient to deal with Milton's work generally in the preceding volume, and consequently the subject was not available here. But this is much to be regretted. Milton's poetical work may very properly be divided into two distinct portions, a process which has actually been applied to Marvell in this history; and as a matter of fact the relations between Milton's late poetical work and the age in which it was produced were far closer than is realised by those who take a superficial view. The Age of Dryden genuinely admired Milton, in spite of his republicanism: Dryden himself referred to him as 'Mr Milton whom we all admire with so much justice,' spoke of *Paradise Lost* as 'one of the greatest, most noble and most sublime poems which either this age or nation has produced,' and wrote lines in which Milton is preferred as an epic poet both to Homer and to Virgil, —a sufficiently remarkable compliment. In any case the poetry of the period is very incomplete without him, and it is unfortunate, moreover, that any encouragement should be given to the idea that if an author is inconvenient, if his presence in any particular period does not suit

our ideas of what the tendencies of the period are or ought to be, we are at liberty to leave him out of account or treat him as if he belonged to some other period. Again, from the list of the prose-writers of the period an important name is missing, that of Bunyan. He too has been dealt with in the preceding volume, but his place was undoubtedly in this:—*Grace Abounding* was published in 1666, and *The Pilgrim's Progress* in 1678.

The literary staple of this volume is supplied mainly by the chapters on Dryden, Butler, the Restoration drama, the Court poets and the development of modern prose. Of these, Dr Ward's chapter on Dryden is by far the most important. His treatment of the subject is altogether admirable: no such comprehensive and judicious account has been hitherto given of the literary work of the man who more than any other impressed his genius upon this age. The poet, the satirist, the dramatist and the prose writer are all appreciated with the same sound and well-balanced criticism, and the whole is admirably summed up in the pages on his great literary qualities with which the chapter concludes.

Butler is dealt with by Mr W. F. Smith, who well brings out the influence of earlier satirists and in particular of Rabelais. In tracing the debt to French medieval satire he seems to imply that Butler was directly acquainted with it, which is perhaps not very likely; but it is interesting to note the emergence in new forms of the traditional motives. The nonconformist sects, as Mr Smith observes, take the place here of the mendicant friars as butts for ridicule, while the debate between Hudibras and the widow represents the 'querelle des femmes,' which appeared in an acute form in the *Roman de la Rose*. Parallels with Rabelais are frequently indicated, rather fancifully sometimes. The comparison of the 'Lobster boil'd,' used in reference to the change of the morning sky from black to red, cannot surely owe anything to the jest of Rabelais about a lobster being cardinalised: nor again is the idea in the line,

> As Rats do from a falling House,

likely to be borrowed directly from Pliny. It was familiar in English long before Butler wrote; as for example in Bacon's Essays, 'It is the wisdom of rats, that will be sure to leave a house somewhat before it fall.' The merit of these things in Butler lies in the application. Mr Smith, however, gives an admirable account of *Hudibras*, and does justice briefly to the rather neglected *Characters*; but he says nothing of Butler's burlesque criticism of the heroic drama, or of his probable share in the *Rehearsal*.

Mr Previté-Orton deals with the minor satirists, of whom Marvell and Oldham are the most important, and with the anonymous political ballads and pamphlets. His treatment is perhaps somewhat too abstract, and is not sufficiently illustrated by references to the text of his authors, but his general criticism is doubtless sound.

Three chapters are devoted to the Restoration drama, which is on

the whole satisfactorily treated. The first, by Professor Schelling, deals with comedy down to Wycherley, the second, by Mr Whibley, mainly with Congreve, Vanbrugh and Farquhar, while in the third Mr Bartholomew writes of the tragedy of the period, including Otway, Lee, Southerne and Rowe, the heroic drama having been for the most part dealt with under the name of Dryden. Professor Schelling rather fully discusses both the earlier and the later Spanish influence on the English drama, and less fully, perhaps as a matter more generally understood, the influence of Molière and the French drama. Mr Whibley shews much fine appreciation, but his estimate of Congreve as a dramatist cannot be accepted without some demur. With what he says of Congreve's brilliancy of style we may readily agree.

> In point and concision, his style is still unmatched in the literature of England. There is never in his writing a word too much or an epithet that is superfluous.... His language appeals always to the ear rather than to the eye. So fine a master of comic diction was he, that, in every line he wrote, you may mark the rise and fall of the actor's voice....He arranges his vowels with the same care which a musician gives to the arrangement of his notes. He avoids the clashing of uncongenial consonants, as a maker of harmonies refrains from discord.

We may allow also that, within the limits of the very artificial world to which his comedy belongs, his drawing of character is admirable: but Mr Whibley in his appreciation of these qualities almost entirely omits to suggest the weakness which justified the failure on the stage of what is in character and dialogue the most brilliant of his comedies, *The Way of the World*. Congreve, in fact, was strangely deficient in the power of construction, and his plots are in several instances so needlessly complicated that it is almost impossible for spectator or reader to render to himself a connected account of the action. Congreve himself may say what he will about the plot of *The Double-Dealer*, but neither he nor Mr Whibley will ever persuade us that it is well constructed, and the failure of *The Way of the World* was doubtless caused by the want of intelligible combination in the plot. Vanbrugh had an architectonic faculty which was wanting to Congreve, and for this reason several of his comedies, *The Provoked Wife*, for example, and *The Confederacy* are better than any of Congreve's, in spite of their inferiority in brilliancy of expression.

In the chapter on the Court poets, also by Mr Whibley, we note the generous estimate of Rochester 'the one man of undisputed genius' in this group, for whose character he has something to say, as well as for his writings. The mark of the amateur is on the productions of the rest, but Rochester must be excluded from this condemnation. 'His energy and concentration entitled him to be judged by the highest standard.'

Professor Saintsbury's chapter on the Prosody of the seventeenth century is a convenient summary of prosodic progress, which suffers somewhat by the practical exclusion of Milton, who has been dealt with already in the seventh volume. The question, moreover, what was the exact contribution of Waller to the development of the couplet measure,

remains here unanswered. It is not a matter merely of concluding the sense within the distich, for that had been done by others: what charmed the ear of Waller's contemporaries was chiefly the special kind of balance and antithesis, in harmony with the character of the stopped couplet, which Waller successfully cultivated, after the model of Ovid far more than of Fairfax, combined with a mechanical smoothness of rhythm which was in contrast with the ruggedness of Jonson and Donne.

The chapter contributed by Mr Wheatley on 'Memoirs and Letter Writers' is disappointing. The writer speaks of the 'enthralling interest' of Pepys's Diary, but he hardly justifies the expression, and he certainly does not succeed in placing these inimitable records in their proper literary position. Instead of this, he occupies valuable space with an account of the author's work for the Navy, which has nothing to do with literature at all.

In the concluding chapter Mr Tilley deals with what was 'perhaps the most important literary achievement that falls within the period,' namely the creation of a prose style which, in structure at least, is essentially the same as that of to-day. For the chronicling of this not inconsiderable achievement the space assigned, of less than five and twenty pages, seems very insufficient. The subject of French influence on English prose, which Mr Tilley is so well qualified to deal with, and the critical examination of the prose of Cowley, Dryden, Temple and Halifax might surely have laid claim to a larger proportion of the volume than this. The style of Halifax, for example, instead of being dismissed in a few words, might well have been thought worthy of a detailed analysis. Within his narrow compass, however, Mr Tilley is thoroughly sound.

Of the remaining contents of the volume it is impossible here to speak fully. Perhaps rather a disproportionate space is given to the representatives of religious movements, the Quakers, the Platonists and Latitudinarians, the Divines of the Church of England; and the chapter on Legal literature belongs really to an earlier period, as indeed is admitted by Dr Ward, who adds to it an interesting appendix on Selden. The philosophical and scientific writings of the age are dealt with competently by Professor Sorley and Dr Shipley.

It must be added that, as usual, the Bibliography is one of the most valuable features of the volume.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Studies and Essays. By Mary Suddard. Cambridge: University Press. 1912. 8vo. 308 pp.

There is always a sense of harshness in judging the work of one whom death has recently carried beyond the reach of praise or blame, and the feeling is intensified when, as in the present case, the writer has been cut down at the very beginning of a promising career. There

is something intrusive even in praise at such a time. But art is greater and more sacred than any individual emotion and the true artist would be the first to feel it an impertinence that his work should be judged on any ground save its own intrinsic merit, or by any standard save the highest. And indeed the work of this girl of twenty-one (already, be it noted, Fellow Univ. Gall.) can afford to stand simply on its own merits. Of mixed French and English parentage Miss Suddard was equally at home in both languages. Several of these essays were first published in French and show evidence of as wide and varied a knowledge and appreciation of French as of English literature—in itself no mean equipment for a critic. A passionate sense of beauty and of the magic of words gives her true insight into the poetry of Shelley and Keats. She is of their kindred and the depth of feeling which she shows in such essays as that on the *Eve of St Agnes* and the *Hymn to Intellectual Beauty* makes us wonder whether she herself might not some day have found poetic expression. The book has the faults of youth, a tendency to over-abundant quotation, an occasional flash of school-boy wit. Miss Suddard loves and hates with a vehemence which necessarily warps her critical judgment at times. She fails to appreciate the royal rage of Ben Jonson stirred to fury at the sight of

> Hell gaping under us, and o'er our heads
> Black ravenous ruin with his sail-stretched wings;

or the capacity for intense feeling, the bitter disillusionment and stern sincerity which underlie Swift's biting cynicism. Nor has she that breadth of grasp which experience of life alone can bring. The essays on *Measure for Measure* and *Chaucer's Art of Portraiture*, clever and promising as they are, show an inevitable immaturity of mind. But it would promise ill for a critic of one-and-twenty if satire and cynicism attracted her as much as beauty and idealism, and a noble and well-founded enthusiasm for constructive art is the best possible basis on which to build. We can afford to pass by with a smile the wilful epigrammatist who sees Dr Primrose in Addison, and turn with sincere admiration to the discriminating lover of literature at its best and noblest whose catholic sympathies embrace John Inglesant and the Wife of Bath, Master Shallow and Adonais. We are often told that it is impossible to say anything new about the great classics of literature whose work has been pored over by scholars and analysed line by line. But sincere criticism must always contain something original, since it bears the impress of the personality of the critic. To say that there is nothing profoundly new in this volume of essays, is to say what is obvious; but the author's delicate perceptiveness makes itself felt on every page. She brings out well that sensitiveness to 'every separate manifestation of loveliness' which marks the early work of Keats, and the way in which this gradually yields to 'what Coleridge defines as the mark of the born poet, "the power of reducing multitude into unity of effect, and modifying a series of thoughts by some one predominant thought or feeling."' She sums up in a happy phrase the secret of

Shelley's weakness as a philosopher:—'Shelley had gone wrong simply through attributing to the common mind a sort of æsthetic acoustic which was entirely lacking.' And her treatment of 'Shelley's Idealism' shows thought as well as sympathy:—'Now, in order to understand Shelley, you must...learn to look upon the ideal we are struggling forward to as not only more true, but as more natural and more normal than the reality we have attained.' And again:—'The child-like innocence of Shelley's mind allowed him to accept the ideal in all its simplicity, without a trace of the astonishment it would have roused in a worldling bound down by the actual forms of reality.' Quite so. It was just this absence of astonishment in the presence of the ideal which at times made Shelley's conduct somewhat disconcerting to worldlings.

Miss Suddard's treatment of Shakespeare, if slight, is suggestive. The comparison drawn between Morose and Shallow's cousin Silence is admirable, though we agree with the author that the earlier comparison of Dame Ursula the pig-woman of *Bartholomew Fair* with Falstaff is hardly fair.

The book is one which will be read with real interest by all lovers of English poetry. It bears the impress of a fine mind, and in its criticism there is much to stimulate thought and arouse enthusiasm.

Grace E. Hadow.

Cirencester.

The Complete Works of George Savile, first Marquess of Halifax. Edited with an Introduction by Walter Raleigh. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1912. 8vo. xxviii + 256 pp.

To have the writings of Halifax published together in a single convenient volume is a thing for which we ought to be grateful. They have of course been collected before, and very carefully edited moreover, by Miss Foxcroft, in her *Life and Letters of Halifax*, but there they serve only as an appendix to the Life, forming a part of the second of two bulky volumes, whereas here we have them by themselves in a much handier form. It is needless to say that they are gracefully introduced by Sir Walter Raleigh, who shews fine appreciation of their literary qualities and of the practical wit and wisdom of the author.

It is the fascination of the writings of Halifax that they were suggested by his experience of life, and are crammed with the lessons drawn directly from that experience. Here are no flights of the imagination, no ingenious ornaments of style, no beautiful vanities of authorship. He quotes none of those fallacious historical precedents which are dear to the mind of the academic scholar; his writings are bare of classical allusion. What he has to tell is what he has found out for himself in the course of his traffic with the world; but he tells it with so much wit and irony, with such acuteness of observation and pungency of phrasing, that he runs some risk of losing the esteem of those who think that wise men must needs be dull. ...English literature is very rich; only a very rich literature could have afforded to

neglect so distinguished a writer. But it is not rich in practical wisdom; and the neglect of Halifax is a thing to be regretted and amended. (p. viii.)

The most popular of the writings of Halifax has been that which stands first in this collection, 'Advice to a Daughter'; but nevertheless it is that which we could perhaps best spare. It is full of good sense and practical acuteness, no doubt, especially in those parts which relate to household management; but with regard to the relations of husband and wife the advice is almost cynical in its assumption that there will be no real depth of affection, and that the wife's endeavour must be chiefly to make what profit she can for herself out of her husband's faults and weaknesses. If he goes astray, he will be less in a position to censure her errors severely; if he is a drunkard, she will have the more opportunities of managing his affairs; if he is a fool, her wit will shine the more by comparison with him. It is not quite pleasant to think of this kind of advice being offered to a young girl, and such persons as Dorothy Osborne must have read it with high-tempered scorn. The much-beloved daughter to whom this 'New Year's Gift' was presented (at the age of thirteen), and who is said to have studied it very carefully, appears not to have been very comfortable to live with, when she became a wife. She was the mother, it may be observed, of that Earl of Chesterfield who is best known now as the author of the 'Letters to his Son.'

There are no such reserves to be made with regard to the other writings of Halifax: we can read them with unmixed pleasure. In such pamphlets as 'The Anatomy of an Equivalent,' and 'A Letter to a Dissenter,' the practical sagacity of the author is thrown into such a form that it cannot easily be disengaged from the passing politics of the moment; but to the remainder—the 'Character of King Charles II,' the 'Thoughts and Reflections,' and 'The Character of a Trimmer'—a higher and more permanent value belongs. The 'Character of King Charles II' is, as Professor Raleigh says, a masterpiece in its kind, and through all its criticism we feel the essential sympathy of the writer with the temperament of the sovereign whom he knew so well. Charles was in fact himself a 'Trimmer' in the less noble sense of the word, and Halifax could not but appreciate his wit, his ready perception of the weaknesses of those with whom he had to do, and his instinctive avoidance of extremes. In the 'Thoughts and Reflections' we have an extremely brilliant and interesting collection of aphorisms, drawn from the practical observation of a man who has seen much of life and who sets down the results of his experience with pungent wit, but without essential bitterness. 'His satire bears no trace of disappointed ambition or poisoned egotism.' It would be dangerous to begin quoting from them, for we should hardly know where to leave off. But it is in 'The Character of a Trimmer' that we find Halifax at his best. Here the personal interest is greatest, for the author is engaged in vindicating his own position; and at the same time the reflections on politics both home and foreign are more valuable and more racy of the soil than elsewhere, while a strain of genuine eloquence is attained in certain passages,

as in the fine eulogy of the king. It is interesting to compare what he writes here of Charles II, at a moment when the liberties of the nation seemed bound up in his life, with the analysis of his character to which we have already referred. The tone is different, but the essential features are the same.

> Though the Nation was lavish of their kindness to him at his first coming, yet there remaineth still a stock of warmth in men's hearts for him. Besides, the good influences of his happy Planet are not yet all spent, and though the stars of men past their youth are generally declining and have less force...yet by a blessing peculiar to himself we may yet hope to be saved even by his Autumnal Fortune. He hath something about him that will draw down a healing miracle for his and our deliverance: ...something in him that wanteth a name, and can no more be defined than it can be resisted, a gift of Heaven of its last finishing, where it will be peculiarly kind. The only Prince in the world that dares be familiar, or that hath right to triumph over those forms which were first invented to give awe to those that could not judge, and to hide defects from those that could; a Prince that hath exhausted himself by his liberality and endangered himself by his mercy; who outshineth by his own light and by his natural virtues all the varnish of studied acquisitions. His faults are like shades to a good picture, or like allay to gold, to make it more useful....In short, whatever he can do, it is no more possible for us to be angry with him than with the bank that secureth us from the raging sea, the kind shade that hideth us from the scorching sun, the welcome hand that reacheth us a reprieve, or with the Guardian Angel that rescueth our souls from the devouring jaws of wretched Eternity.

Usually his style is on a more familiar level, and even the more exalted passages are usually brought down to a lower pitch before they are concluded. Thus his well-known expression of patriotic idolatry concludes with a reference to 'the modern experiment by which the blood of one creature is transmitted into another,' and the enthusiastic praises of Truth are succeeded by the half humourous claim to enlist our climate, our Church, our Laws, nay Virtue itself (as the mean between two extremes) in the Trimmer's cause, while the formidable list of the opponents with which the champions of either extreme will have to contend, begins with Nature, Religion, and Liberty, but concludes characteristically with Common Sense.

We have cause to be grateful, as has been said, to Professor Raleigh for making these things more conveniently accessible; but we have a quarrel with him nevertheless. The text which he gives us is founded upon the first collected edition, the *Miscellanies* of 1700, so far as regards the works included in that volume; but he should surely have told us something of the previous separate editions. We ought at least to know the date and circumstances of the first publication of each of these tracts, and the authority upon which the text of them ultimately rests. Professor Raleigh gives us nothing but vague or misleading statements. Of the 'Advice to a Daughter' he tells us that 'alone among the writings published during his life-time' it 'seems to have been carefully prepared by his own hand for the press.' What does he make of the booksellers' advertisement in the second edition of 1688, in which we are informed that it was originally printed from a copy surreptitiously taken by a scrivener to whom it had been sent to be

copied out, and then corrected by the original manuscript, of which the use was obtained from the same source? Does he suggest that this was a deliberate mystification on the part of Halifax? Surely the more reasonable opinion is that the work was not intended for publication at all at this time, and indeed the references which it contains to the young Lady Betty's future husband must have been a little embarrassing when the time for her betrothal arrived.

Again, why does the editor think that none of the other writings were prepared by the author for the press? 'The Anatomy of an Equivalent' and the 'Letter to a Dissenter' were undoubtedly sent to the press by Halifax himself, and why should we suppose that they were not prepared for the press by his hand? The text of the first editions is almost faultless.

But it is in the case of 'The Character of a Trimmer' that we most feel the want of editorial information. Here the early editions are full of errors, some of which still persist, and unless we take into account the history of the text, it is impossible to feel at all sure of our ground. This pamphlet was first circulated in manuscript, and was published in 1688 from a copy found among the papers of Sir William Coventry, who was the uncle of Halifax. Hence it was at first ascribed to his authorship and bore either his initials or his full name on the title-page of at least four editions. The early editions are full of errors, but in 1697, two years after the death of the author, a so-called third edition (actually the fifth at least) was published, which professed to have had the advantage of correction by the hand of Halifax, though the publisher still apparently believed that the author was Sir William Coventry. Halifax seems to have corrected some mistakes here and there, and to have made some changes for the sake of greater clearness of expression, but he did not live long enough to revise the proofs, as we are told he had meant to do, and the edition cannot be regarded as having his sanction throughout. A good many bad mistakes passed from it into the edition of 1700.

In Miss Foxcroft's edition (1898) the text is based upon two of the manuscript copies, those that she calls B and C, which give a distinctly better text than the early printed editions. But besides the three generally recognised quarto editions published in 1688 and 1689, which are all dependent on the same original copy and for the most part successively reproduce the same errors, there was another, to which attention has not hitherto been called, and with which Miss Foxcroft was not acquainted. Of this I have found one copy only, among the Acton books, in the Cambridge University Library, and this has lost its title-page, so that the exact date of publication cannot be ascertained. It evidently belongs to about the same period as the others, but it is quite distinct from them, having been printed from a manuscript closely resembling B in the character of its text. It has errors of its own, of course, but it hardly ever shares those of the other editions, so that their mistakes can almost invariably be corrected from it. The material which it affords for this purpose is available also for the most part in

the best manuscripts, but it supplies a valuable confirmation of their text, and to some a printed edition will no doubt seem more authoritative than a manuscript copy[1].

The information which Professor Raleigh gives us about the text which he has printed is of the most meagre description. In the case of 'The Character of a Trimmer' he professes to have revised and emended the edition which he follows, and especially to have adopted several emendations from Miss Foxcroft's edition, but he has told us nothing of the principles upon which he has worked and has specified his alterations in three instances only, mentioned rather casually in the Introduction. This leaves us with a sense of uneasiness which is to be set at rest only by a closer examination than the ordinary reader can be expected to give. In fact, Professor Raleigh has in about five-and-thirty instances corrected errors by reference to Miss Foxcroft's edition. These are, in about an equal proportion, mistakes which had come down uncorrected from the early editions and misprints which belong especially to the *Miscellanies*. But he is far from having purified his text from all its corruptions, and it becomes necessary to note some of the instances in which it remains unsatisfactory. The references are to page and line of his edition[2].

p. 53, l. 2. The punctuation is certainly wrong here. The Acton quarto begins a new paragraph. 'When such sacred things as the Laws,' etc.

p. 54, ll. 8 f. 'the Confusion, the Parity.' We should read here 'the Confusion of Parity,' with the manuscripts and Acton. (See Miss Foxcroft's note.)

p. 61, l. 7. 'will not be prone to follow.' Whence does the editor take this reading? All the editions with which I am acquainted have 'proud,' and so apparently the manuscripts.

p. 62, l. 17. 'so well reconciled.' Read rather 'so happily reconciled,' with the better manuscripts and Acton. In the other early editions the adverb was omitted, till 'well' was supplied in 1697.

l. 33. 'the envy of our Neighbour.' The true reading is undoubtedly 'Neighbours': so in Ed. 1, Acton and the manuscripts.

p. 67, l. 6. The punctuation should be corrected by placing a colon after 'next.'

p. 71, l. 18. 'which doth not want the applause, from the greater part of Mankind.' Read 'which yet doth not want the applause of the greater part of Mankind,' with Acton and the better manuscripts.

p. 72, l. 12. 'the devout fire of mistaken Charity.' This is a bad misprint, which the editor ought not to have overlooked. The early editions and the manuscripts have 'the devout Fire of mutual Charity.' The word 'mistaken' was borrowed from 'a mistaken Devotion' in the line above, and makes nonsense of the expression.

[1] This book is a quarto of 47 pp. printed with more liberality of spacing and more regard for typographical distinctions than the other three editions of the early period, which have respectively 43, 43 and 38 pages. At the end there is a bookseller's notice which seems to suggest 1687 or 1688 as the date of publication. I refer to it as 'Acton.'

[2] For the readings of the MSS. I am dependent on Miss Foxcroft.

p. 79, l. 26. Read 'tho' his own Subjects too,' with the manuscripts and Acton.

p. 83, l. 20. 'look upon it as they do upon Escutcheons, the more Antient Religion of the two.' The editor has endeavoured here to emend a corrupt text by going back to the scarcely less unsatisfactory reading of the second edition. He should read 'look upon it as the better Scutcheon, the more ancient Religion of the two,' with the best manuscripts and Acton.

p. 84, l. 17. 'his now humble Confessor': 'now' is a correction, after Miss Foxcroft's text, for 'new'; but read probably 'his own humble Confessor,' with MS. B and Acton.

l. 23. 'which will then be the Landlord.' This is a conjectural alteration by the editor, but it can hardly be accepted. The sentence runs thus: 'the usurping Landlord (as he will then be called) shall hardly be admitted to be so much as a Tenant to his own Lands, lest his title should prejudge that of the Church, which will then be the language'; the emphasis being on 'usurping' and 'prejudge,' and the clause 'which will then be the language' corresponding to 'as he will then be called.'

p. 87, l. 5. Read 'and it would,' with all the earlier authorities.

p. 89, l. 9. Read 'make him forget' with the manuscripts and Acton.

p. 90, l. 12. ''Twas a forced putt; and tho' France wisely dissembled their inward dissatisfaction, yet' etc. Read 'It was a forced putt, and the French wisely dissembled their inward dissatisfaction; yet' etc., with the better manuscripts and Acton.

l. 33. Omit 'and' with Ed. 2, and begin a new sentence, 'It was thought.'

p. 91, l. 21. Begin a new sentence with 'When at the same time,' Acton.

p. 93, l. 35. 'an overgrowing Power.' Read 'an overgrown Power': so the manuscripts and Acton.

p. 96, l. 26. Read '*Grand Louis*' (as the name of a ship) for 'Grand *Louis*.' So Acton.

p. 100, l. 4. 'he will neither be Bawled, Threatned, Laught, nor Drunk out of them.' This was the original text, no doubt, but 'Bawled' having been misunderstood and corrupted, it was altered in the edition of 1697 to 'Hectored,' probably by the authority of Halifax. This then should perhaps be retained.

p. 102, l. 20. 'can be so great as to prevent it.' Read 'can be too great to prevent it,' with the manuscripts and Acton, giving a quite different meaning.

p. 103, l. 19. 'the Phrenzy of Platonick Visions,' an absurd corruption. Read 'the Phrenzy of Phanatic Visions,' with Acton and the better manuscripts. The spelling 'Phanatic,' which is found in the Acton quarto accounts partly for the 'Platonick' of the other editions.

A few more references may be permitted to the readings of the Acton quarto.

p. 61, l. 5 f. Acton appears to stand alone in reading 'The two

Czaars are an example,' which was what the author originally wrote. Owing to the corruption and misunderstanding of the text it was altered in 1697.

p. 77 (last line). 'the Cardinals having rescued the Church from those Clownish Methods the Fishermen had first introduc'd.' The Acton text reads 'refined' for 'rescued,' and this was probably what Halifax wrote.

p. 85 (middle). 'Temporal things will have their weight in the World.' The author wrote originally 'Mortal things,' which appears in Acton and the better manuscripts and is much finer. The misunderstanding and corruption of the word ('Moral' in the other early editions) led to the substitution for it of 'Temporal' in 1697, perhaps by Halifax.

p. 87. 'a great deal involv'd in the fate of their Neighbours.' Acton reads 'State' for 'fate,' which suits the context better.

p. 97 (middle). 'he would rather dye than see a spire of English Grass trampled down by a Foreign Trespasser.' The reading 'spire' for 'piece,' which was restored by Miss Foxcroft from MS. C, is also that of the Acton quarto.

Finally, in confirmation of the authenticity of the Acton text, we may note the care shown in its typographical distinctions and the fact that alone of all the printed texts it consistently gives us the termination *-eth* (*th*) in the third person singular of the present tense, a usage which was undoubtedly followed by Halifax.

Before parting with Professor Raleigh, we may congratulate him on the portrait of Halifax which is prefixed to the book, a beautiful reproduction of the picture by Lely at Hardwicke Hall. This is Halifax as we should desire him to have been, features worthy of the motto finely chosen by Miss Foxcroft for her Life of him,

> Turning to scorn with lips divine
> The falsehood of extremes.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

A Survey of English Literature, 1780–1830. By Oliver Elton. 2 vols. London: Arnold. 1912. 8vo. xv + 456, xii + 475 pp.

The profession of teaching literature to the young is of all occupations the most pleasant, and yet the most difficult and delicate. It is, moreover, a modern occupation. Fifty years ago, except for an odd digression in the classical form-room like that passage about Helen in *Tom Brown*, no such thing was heard of. But now literary teachers are everywhere, and the responsibility is very particular, for the development is artificial, and introduces a new element into education. You teach a boy to decline 'mensa,' and once he has learnt it he knows as much about it as you do and is as competent to possess the information. You familiarise a boy with the imaginings of the greatest poets and with what you think about them, and by giving the stock of maturity to immaturity, you

have prevented him from growing up in the natural order of the years. He has been taught the most vital things before he has begun to live, and been initiated in ideas before he is able, often before he is in the least degree able, to distinguish among them for himself. How easy to fossilise the fancy or shipwreck the judgment. The safest pupils are those of forty, such as those who once listened to Hazlitt, men who had been over the ground that he was covering, and though they could not talk of their own passions and disappointment, knew what he was talking about. In University class-rooms one disturbs the air for younger ears, and it would be singular if the blameless ruminator on Marlowe, Keats or Shelley did not sometimes wing the 'wanton imagination,' or provoke, in Lamb's words, 'that disgust at common life, that *tædium quotidianarum formarum*, which an unrestricted passion for ideal forms and beauties is in danger of producing.' And yet surely it would be wasteful to decide that, when youth had the chance, it should see nothing of the best and hear only of the secondary. Average youth has no such original quantum of sensibility that it is in danger of over-stimulation, and we may do something, and that very safely, to wake the dead.

One indulges in such speculations on closing Professor Elton's two volumes, for the first impression is that they are eminently the work of a teacher. The considering tone as much as the considered omissions, and these no less than the wide-ranging judgment, would convince us of this. But to say it at once, here is a book in which nothing is fenced with, which deals fairly with broken lives and the highest aspirations, with the relation of morals, literature and religion, and which is neither anxious nor in the least afraid; a book which displays everywhere the literary character of its author, at once austere and humane. If taste is to be trained, and not merely left to be slowly formed by its own growing up, it must be in some such atmosphere as this. To let twenty-one unguided boys loose in a library is a risky proceeding for perhaps twenty, however salutary for the twenty-first. But here they are all piloted without insistence, gently habituated to consider, taught insensibly that there is no danger where there are no danger-boards, and made heirs of Time and of Invention. Those who believe in teaching life at all can advance no better argument than Professor Elton.

That is one's first impression, but it is not meant to suggest that this book was written solely for students, or even with an eye to them. Indeed its charm is its tone of literary equality. It presupposes some knowledge as well as some culture in its readers, more than is usual with the public, or even with students, though the assumption may go some way to create it in them, the culture and knowledge that belong to the literary class to which it is addressed. It goes over an old story and, while telling the whole story, tells it newly. It has the right atmosphere, and yet what it says is by no means of course to the oldest hearers of the tale. Part of this newness Mr Elton owes to copiousness of reading, part to a judgment always balanced but always alive, but most and without question to the presence everywhere of an exquisite taste.

He has read—what has he not read? One work it is amusing to learn he has not read is Amos Cottle's verse translation of the Edda. He shares Benjamin Thorpe's inability to procure a copy of that justly unknown book, but he has read everything else that slumbers on the shelves: *Man as he is Not*, *The Old Manor House*, the Banims' tales, *Speed the Plough*, the early numbers of *The Edinburgh* and *Quarterly*, Mrs Opie, Dermody, Mrs Hemans, Southey's poems and Milman's plays, and he pays tribute to the forgotten Clare. He supplies the plots of some of Maturin's less known novels, and an account of Mrs Reeve's two elegant dialogues, *The Progress of Romance*.

At the same time, readable and original always as Mr Elton is, his chief qualities come out most clearly in dealing with the greater poets. He does appreciate 'that touch of warranted and experienced bitterness' which was Crabbe's, but of Crabbe and Cowper he has not so much that is arresting to say as he has of Burns. Compare what he says of Rogers, 'He has the wish rather than the power to be [a poet], and possesses taste the *feminine* of talent' which is true and sufficient, with this of a poet of different stamp: 'If we ask what Burns represents, above all, in the life and temper of his country, and what therefore is his essence, it is, to borrow a phrase from a later singer, *the freedom of the natural soul*'; which is not only true, it is the truth discovered for us.

Equally good are the stray sayings on general aesthetics. The thing to be noted about the effect of that collection of ideas and events which made the Romantic Revival is that 'First of all the senses of the artist are regenerated.' He traces too 'the return from the bare reason to the heart and emotions, at first for their own sake, but next as affording a surer revelation, and opening a window into the infinite,' and he points out as a characteristic of all these Revolution poets 'a certain directness, clarity and strength, which give us a large, rapid impression,' or, in other words, that natively and without straining they responded to big impulses. Elsewhere, he tells us more generally: 'A poet's aim is to find words which will enable him to pass on to us, with the least of loss, the precise kind of pleasure—including of course painful pleasure—that he has received,' and there is another *obiter dictum* in his judgment on *St Ronan's Well*: 'An artist would cease to be an artist if he did not leave us with more definite ideas than it is right for him to formulate.' A phrase that will remain is where speaking of *The Decline and Fall*, *The Wealth of Nations*, *The Lives of the Poets*, and Boswell's *Johnson*, he ends shortly 'all this is Roman work and made to stand.'

It would be unfair to part from this first volume without acknowledging that Scott's supremacy in lyric poetry is duly noted by a critic able fully to recognise it, and that Jane Austen's excellences are distinguished accurately and, in this Suffragist age, with some boldness, from her defects and limitations: 'For the first time in England women are nicely depicted by their own sex, sometimes with heart and sympathy, but oftener with that cool, intimate veracity which is so salutary, but which omits so much of the essence of women as men see them.' It is true he is here writing of a whole school, but the same note

is in his valedictory words: '"Even the sweetest woman," says Nietzsche, "is bitter." But this is the penalty of sweetness; Miss Austen is not "sweet," and therefore not, or not fundamentally, bitter. Her gaze is like that of a mirror; it reflects daylight, with rare rays of tempered sun. But it is also feminine in a profound degree. She sees her world as men could not see it if they would, as they would feel ashamed of seeing it if they could, and as they admire her for seeing it; and they feel at once, disconcerted, how much her presentment omits, and how truthful it is nevertheless. This is the way of most women; they see what has all the while been under our nose, and show it to us, and laugh at us for our blindness. She, however, has none of their dependence or inconsequence, of which we at once take advantage. She is the woman our enemy. We could only have the advantage of her by taking her off her own ground; and, artist and humourist as she is, she knows this, and never quits her ground. The contest is a drawn one. She abides; we acknowledge her, we do not quite like her, and we quit her —perhaps run away from her—not without relief, bidding to such cold voices a somewhat long farewell.'

In the second volume there are four or five essays each as close to its subject and as minutely careful in recording feeling as the rest. Mr Elton has lived with Wordsworth, and though from a passage on page 114 we may suspect him of Lamb's heresy when reflecting on the comparative merits of Coleridge, he gets into the tone of Wordsworth as a poet:

> How could the innocent heart bear up and live!

and what is more gets the sense of it into us. Here Wordsworth is considered aesthetically, so much so as to give the critic a new way of approach. It is not in a devotee's judgment an essay quite adequate to the poet's achievement, but it is almost entirely novel, and, though not the whole truth, all true. 'He has written, in the *Prelude* and the pieces that cluster round it, poetry that disinfects life for us'; and again 'The charm of the poem (*The Prelude*) is found in its soft interfusion of story, scenery, and high reflective matter.' How absolutely it is caught—disinfect! soft interfusion! In this essay, for once, the critic is a little impatient of the missionary. Of Shelley, about whom he has perhaps fewer memorable things to say—of Shelley as a missionary he is not so impatient. When dealing with Wordsworth, he attaches little poetical weight to doctrine, but when he comes to count Shelley up *his* teaching is allowed for. 'He did not see that progress is likely to be as slow as ever, and did not allow for relapses or the need of coercion. All this is too plain for words: and yet he is among the prophets because he saw the goal.' This means, of course, that unconsciously Mr Elton assumes Wordsworth to be the even greater poet. Abstract Shelley from his doctrine, and it would be impossible for a mind of the first critical capacity to consider his manner as patiently as Mr Elton has here weighed that of Wordsworth. Is this to be unjust? Wordsworth's poetry 'describes, and talks and preaches about the

sources of its own happiness; and yet in spite of taking this risk, it remains poetry, it can still communicate the happiness of which it talks.' It is admirably said, but how can it come to be said? Surely not without having taken into unconscious count the interfusion of the doctrine?

The paper on Byron is singularly fearless, the most complete of the estimates, a model of how to be frank without the least undress; but it is easy to see that Keats is the 'favourite' poet. And this is appropriate, for Keats, with all his limitations, is the touchstone of literary sensibility. As regards his relations to Spenser and the Jacobean poets Mr Elton well observes: 'From them (and not only from the dusty Lempriere as used to be supposed) he learnt tales like those of Endymion, and Glaucus, and Syrinx, and Pan, and Hyacinthus. In this mixed, surcharged form the antique came to him, with the profusion, the heady perfume, the formlessness of nature herself, as of a bean-field over which bees are murmuring.'

Indeed this essay is a series of rightnesses, with its comment on *The Grecian Urn*, and on *The Nightingale*: 'At the end the dream is out and the music fled; but meanwhile sorrow has disappeared under the power of the very imagination that works upon it'; and with what is said of *The Eve of Saint Mark*, 'the Sabbath scene, and the girl reading the legend, and her "uneasy" shadow on the walls.' Detached and for itself this paper would raise any critic's reputation.

It is necessary to say this plainly, because in so large a book travelling over such familiar ground the public may not always realise the sureness of the writer's touch. But take the contrast between Hazlitt and Lamb: Hazlitt 'communicates his own enjoyment, and makes us a defiant present of it, as his; but in Lamb the old poet speaks again, as though his spirit were but taking up a new instrument and breathing through it.' Or take this of De Quincey, 'in him rhythm is an even deeper thing than vision.'

There are many memorable phrases—'the bitter felicities' of Webster's blank metre; 'Shelley's daily life and talk, with its gentle play and soft sparkle'; and the characterisation of *Songs of Innocence*, as the little pamphlet with all its blue and picture originally appeared: 'The touches of rarer colour and transfiguring diction answer to the bolder flourishes that break out amidst the soft spray-work of the margin.' He is alive to the beauty of such sayings when they appear in the work of others, as when Landor makes Horne Tooke speak of 'the sweet temperature of thought in Addison.'

Such delicacy will be appreciated by everyone, but it is possible that from this book as a whole Mr Elton's power of exact insight coupled with exact statement will not be appreciated as it should. Its very exactness may prevent it. Covering so wide a field and dealing with so many writers of subsidiary rank it is a matter of necessity that often, to say what is arresting would be to say what is wrong. It is a paradox, but the peculiar capacity with which the critic has discharged his pondered task of years does in part in this

very real book hide his peculiar capacity. And if we are to judge the book solely from the point of view of literature, this is a defect. There are two explanations that stare one in the face. In the first place, unless we are to suppose that the work will take its place as the starting point for students of this epoch, and it is too fine for that, the book is too full, there is too much that is there merely because it is germane. In the second place the continuity is too even. There are no misses, no misfires, no aiming above the mark. We are helped too much: we are not surprised or startled into thought. It would be ungrateful to suggest a change in manner when it is just its manner that makes the book itself, and yet somehow, though the senses of the reader are refined, they are not regenerated. Could there be made in future—one is thinking of its author in future being seen at full length—could there be made some sacrifice either of modesty or truth? If the critic were to think a little more often of himself and of *his* point of contact with us, and a little less constantly and singly of his authors and *their* effect! But such speculations are idle. It is useless to ask a good writer to be other than he is. A man's merit is himself, and if Mr Elton were to think of show, he would cease to be himself.

A. A. Jack.

London.

Poetical Works of Robert Bridges, excluding the eight Dramas. H. Frowde: London. 1912. 8vo. 472 pp.

All who are interested in English verse will welcome this complete and compact edition of the poetical works, other than dramatic, of our foremost living singer. Complaints have been made—sometimes with, sometimes without cause—of difficulty in procuring some of his poems; this is now at an end. The 'Shorter Poems' have long been accessible in cheap form. To these are added in this volume 'Prometheus' and 'Demeter,' 'Eros and Psyche,' 'The Growth of Love,' the collection known as 'New Poems,' a further collection here styled 'Later Poems,' and (now collected for the first time) 'Poems in Classical Prosody'; in this last are included some short pieces not previously published. Except for the eight Plays, therefore, this volume of the 'Oxford Poets' series presents in handy form the entire poetical works, down to date, of a writer whose long connexion with Oxford lends special appropriateness to his appearance in this series.

It cannot be needful now to describe these poems, or to discuss them on the score of poetic quality. Their true inspiration and skilled workmanship, the quiet grace of their style, the scholarly handling of both subject and expression, have long since won for their author a place of his own among our poets. If a certain academic perfume be usually discernible, it never lapses into pedantry or mars his native music—that is, in the poems which fill the bulk of this volume. Straightforwardness is as much a mark of their diction as refinement,

delicacy is combined with vigour; the thought is neither teased into obscurity nor overlaid by stiff embroideries of metre. A passionate simplicity of utterance, indeed, attends his highest achievement, especially in lyrical verse. But Mr Bridges is a critic as well as a poet, and in two directions has been an innovator in practice as well as theory; a few words on these points will not be out of place here.

One relates to what he calls 'stress-rhythms.' Developing the view hinted by Coleridge in the preface to *Christabel*, he has sought to give speech-accent a place of supremacy over all other elements of metre. Bold effects have been obtained in this way, by himself and by the younger singers who have followed his guidance; yet not without proportionate loss. Excessive reliance on speech-accent inevitably fosters a kind of go-as-you-please metre, too loose in texture to weave the finest patterns. It also leads to a hampering uncertainty of cadence; for even our word-accent is not always fixed, and our sentence-accent is essentially fugitive and changeful. How, for example, shall we read these first two lines of a 'Dirge' (p. 399):

> Man born of desire
> Cometh out of the night?

Shall we read them to two beats or to three? There is nothing in the context to tell us; the lines which follow vary in length. Unless we could hear the poet read his lines, we cannot know how he means them to be read. This instability of accent will always prevent it being, taken by itself, an adequate basis of rhythm. If the Master himself does not often err in this way, his followers constantly do, leaving readers to make verse of given lines as best they may; and the theory of 'stress-rhythm' must be held accountable for these shortcomings.

The other innovation is that of 'quantitive metres,' essayed by the poet in fulfilment of a pledge to a deceased friend. These are avowedly experiments, on a new basis of metrical structure. Poets have every right to try experiments, but this particular one has been tried over and over again, from the days when Gabriel Harvey urged it on Spenser, to the days when Tennyson discussed it with his friends Clough and Spedding, and it has never proved acceptable. How, indeed, can readers be expected to enjoy verse which is based on principles wholly foreign to the genius of their language? The poets of Rome adopted Greek measures; but they had not centuries of glorious native poetry behind them, they did not try to preserve accentual verse along with quantitative, and there is no proof that stress-accent held in Latin speech the place of supreme importance that it does in English speech. These general considerations, without going into details, seem to show why this particular experiment has always been unsuccessful. If, however, it must be tried again, it could not be in better hands; and it is convenient to have these various attempts brought together within the covers of one book. On this account also, then, this volume of the 'Oxford Poets' deserves hearty welcome.

T. S. Omond.

Tunbridge Wells.

Essays on questions connected with the Old English poem of Beowulf. By KNUT STJERNA. Translated and edited by J. R. CLARK HALL. Coventry: for the Viking Club. 1912. 8vo. xxxv + 284 pp.

One of the most hopeful signs in Anglo-Saxon studies at the present day is the increasing attention which is being given to the *realien* of older Teutonic civilisation, and Dr Clark Hall and the Viking Club are to be sincerely congratulated on the production of a volume which for the first time enables the student who has no knowledge of modern Scandinavian languages to realise the work done by archaeologists like Knut Stjerna in throwing light on the history and civilisation of the Migration Period.

Dr Hall himself anticipates many of the criticisms which might be passed on these essays. A good many points are scored by the acceptance of doubtful readings or doubtful interpretations of disputed passages in the text of *Beowulf*. One whole essay, viz. that on the Double Burial, interesting as it is in itself, can only be connected with *Beowulf* at all by accepting Dr Stjerna's entirely unjustified statement that Hildeburh placed two sons on the funeral pyre and his very doubtful interpretation of 'earme on eaxle' in l. 1117. The author is also rather too ready to assume the weaving together of lays of different authorship, *e.g.* in the story of Scyld's obsequies or in that of Beowulf's burial in order to explain apparent archaeological inconsistencies. He is also guilty of pressing the interpretation of some pieces of archaeological evidence too far in support of his own theories, as when he tries to interpret the figures on the Vendel helmet as representing the Beowulf dragon-story or something closely akin to it. At times the literary evidence is unfairly pressed in order to give support to the supposed requirements of archaeology, as when the passage about 'leoda faesten ealand utan eorðweard ðone' (ll. 2333–4) is taken as a description of Öland and used in support of the very doubtful theory that the power of the Geatas lay chiefly in East Götland and Öland, a theory which necessitates the shifting of Heorot from the neighbourhood of Leire to some part of Skaane in the oldest part of the Danish kingdom.

These are, however, but slight blemishes on a work of real scholarship and exact science. Dr Stjerna had a wide knowledge not only of European archaeology, but of folk-lore and ancient custom throughout the world, and he used them to the best advantage in the essays dealing with the funerals of Beowulf and of Scyld. In the essay on Vendel and the Vendel Crow, by a skilful combination of philological, geographical and archaeological evidence he reconstructs the story of one of the centres of culture in the Swedish Uppland in the days before the Viking period, while in all the essays alike we have a careful selection and keen analysis of all those archaeological remains which can be used for illustration of the weapons, ornaments and trappings of the followers of Hrothgar and Beowulf. Occasionally the author seems to have missed the point. Thus in ll. 445–455, where

Beowulf asks Hrothgar to send back his armour to Hygelac if he falls in battle, the reference is surely not to any thought that Hygelac might put the armour in a grave with a cenotaph in honour of the dead warrior, but to the well-known practice of 'heriot' whereby the arms of the retainer were restored to his lord after death—but such mistakes are rare.

The translator has done his work well. The only serious slip would seem to be the use of 'Norseman' on pp. 8 and 58, where 'Northman' is the term required. In addition to the translation Dr Hall has given us a sound introduction, some good critical notes on points of doubtful interpretation, and an index of *realien* reprinted (and expanded) from his own prose translation of Beowulf. The illustrations here and throughout the book reflect great credit on the printer.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

The Place-names of Oxfordshire. By HENRY ALEXANDER. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1912. 8vo. 251 pp.

In the author's Note or Preface we are told that this book was originally a dissertation in the School of English Language of the University of Liverpool. Professor Wyld, who contributes an Introduction, has reason to be well satisfied with the work of his pupil, Mr Alexander, which will take rank as one of the most scholarly studies yet published in the investigation of English place-names. As might have been expected, the phonological side of the enquiry has claimed the lion's share, and the main results are set out with great clearness in Part I of the author's Introduction. In Parts II, III and IV we are given valuable notes on change of suffixes, levelling of suffixes, popular etymology, O.E. elements of the names, together with peculiarities of M.E. orthography. In the appendices there are alphabetical lists of personal names and words other than personal names used as first elements, also a list of second elements and finally a bibliography. The investigation of the names, which occupies the main part of the book, is conducted in the great majority of instances on sound lines, and the 'imagination' displayed is of a commendably sober quality. Mr Alexander has however in not a few instances started with what we consider a fanciful or demonstrably incorrect explanation and afterwards thrown in, casually as it were, the fruit of a sounder judgment. The following criticisms and suggestions have occurred to the reviewer in reading through the book.

Abesditch *or* Avesditch: Dr Bradley's suggestion, O.E. *efes* 'border of a wood,' cannot be accepted for the first element, as it would give Eaves. We may compare Avishayes, Dorset and Somerset, also Austhwaite, Cumb., a 13th century form of which is *Auesthwayt.* The first element is probably a personal name such as *Ælf-*. Britwell can hardly

mean 'the bright well,' judging by the early forms, which have mostly *Bru-*; whereas in Brightwell, with which Mr Alexander compares Britwell, the early forms are nearly all in *Bri-*. On p. 64 we are told that *Broynes* 'undoubtedly expresses the 17th cent. pronunciation of this diphthong,' i.e. the diphthong which in the 16th century developed from [ī]. This is incorrect, as [oi] or [ɔi] from [ī] did not take place until much later, and then only in London and S. provincial speech. The first element of Burcot is not explained. Charlbury is explained as 'the town of the "churls"'; but what meaning can be attached to this expression, if O.E. *ceorl* meant 'labourer, servant (on a farm),' as we are told on p. 73? Under Chastleton Mr Alexander says 'the dictionaries explain this (O.E. *stān-ceastl*) as "chestnut-tree," but there is nothing to prove that it does not mean a cairn or a cromlech.' The dictionaries are right; *-ceastel*, which occurs also as *cistel, cisten, cist, cyst*, is from Lat. *castanea*; see these forms in Bosworth-Toller. It is doubtful whether O.E. *tūn* in place-names ever means 'an enclosed group of homesteads out of which the village and town later sprung' (p. 75). The development in meaning of *tūn* in place-names and its development as a separate word went probably on different lines. The suggestion of O.E. *cine* or *cinu*, 'a chink,' 'fissure,' 'chasm,' 'cavern,' to explain the first element of Chinnor is, we think, not to be received. A personal name, such as *Cyne-*, is more probable. *Chinestan* occurs for *Cynestan* in a charter (*cit.* Searle). On pp. 79, 92, etc., O.E. *ham(m)* is explained as 'an enclosure,' but there is no evidence whatever that it had such a meaning. The suggested explanation of Cookley as 'the growing (quick) meadow,' O.E. (*æt*) *cucan* (*cwican*) *lēage* would have been better omitted. The alternative given, the personal name *Cuca*, is much more probable. The suggested explanation of Cornwell as 'the spring next the cornfield,' is, we think, extremely unlikely. Nor do we think Crawley means 'the meadow of the crows'; nor that Crowmarsh was named after the bird. Even in Crowsley Mr Alexander does not wholeheartedly see a personal name. There is no real evidence that Draycott could mean 'an isolated homestead' and Drayton 'an isolated "tūn."' We do not feel satisfied that Ducklington is 'the hill of the ducklings,' unless the 'ducklings' were men; nor that Forest Hill means 'the frosty hill'; nor that Foxcott or Foscott means 'the fox-dwelling.' Mr Alexander has not noticed that the first element of Garsington occurs in Gressingham, Lancs., and is explained by Wyld as 'grass field.' The *d* of Handborough is hardly 'the result of a combinative sound-change'; but is more probably a modern fanciful or 'etymological' spelling. The Pipe Roll form *Hageneƀga* is obviously the oldest of those given, and at once points to the old and well attested pers. n. *Hagana, Hagena, Hagona*, as the first element, not to *Hana*. Hanger Hill (near Caversfield) and Hunger Hill (near Bicester) are taken to be the same name and are derived by Mr Alexander from O.E. *hangra*, 'a wood growing on the side of a hill-top.' Mr Alexander, like the editors of the Crawford Charters, and Dr Skeat, is of opinion that Hunger has developed from

Hangra. This is not possible. Skeat derives Hungerford, Berks., from *hangra,* although all the early forms he cites show *u,* not *a.* The form Hunger- is clearly the personal name *Hungær* or *Hungar* (see Searle). Mr Alexander's statement that *hungra* is identical with '*hangra* but in a different Ablaut grade,' seems a declension from his usual high level of philological acumen. 'Ablaut grade' is a sort of *deus ex machina,* which must not be invoked too frequently. The 1261 form *Clehungre* for modern Clayhanger is due to the common scribal confusion between *a* and *u.* Hempton is explained as '(at) the high enclosure' from O.E. *æt hēan tūne.* The change of *n* of earlier forms to *m* of 14th century and modern forms, is hardly to be accounted for by 'the analogy of the word *hām.*' Possibly the first element was *Hefn,* from *Hefan,* gen. case of the personal name *Hefa*; *fn* became *mn, m* in O.E. as in *emn, stemn.* In Heyford and Heythrop Mr Alexander seems to think that O.E. *hege* means simply 'hedge.' This was doubtless the original meaning, but it came to be generally used for a space enclosed in a forest and then a forest-clearing; see Vinogradoff, *Engl. Soc. in 11th Cent.,* p. 292. In connection with Hoar Stone, from O.E. *hār stān,* the question arises, whether our ancestors may not have lime-washed the boundary stones to make them more visible. They may also have lime-washed fruit-trees to keep off insects; this would account for *hār apulder* in a charter. The article under Holmwood needs revision, as O.E. *holm* never means 'hill.' The first sentence in Bosworth-Toller *s. v. holm,* cited by Mr Alexander, should be deleted, as it is absurd. Middendorf, also cited, is hardly an authority to quote for *meanings* of O.E. words, as he is frequently in error. The word *holm,* very common in Northern place-names, and derived from O.N. *holmr,* has one or two quite definite meanings which are given in the English Dialect Dictionary. Another explanation suggested by Mr Alexander, that *holm* is a variant for M.E. *holin,* 'holly,' is clearly the right one. In some mod. E. dialects 'holm' is commonly used for holly: see E.D.D. Holton hardly means 'the nook or hidden settlement'; it means, judging by the early forms, simply 'piece of land on a "hale" or "haugh,"' i.e. 'low-lying level ground by the side of a river,' as the E.D.D., cited by Mr Alexander, tells us. The suggestion, scorned by Mr Alexander, that Iffley, early forms of which are *Gifetelea, Givetelei,* means a 'field of gifts,' has perhaps something to be said in its favour. The O.E. *gift* means 'sum of money or its equivalent offered or paid by a suitor to his bride's family.' The suggested meaning of O.E. *slæp,* quoted from Bosworth-Toller, 'a slippery, miry place?' cannot be accepted. The dial. word *slap* means 'a narrow pass between two hills'; 'a gap or temporary opening in a hedge, fence, &c.' See E.D.D. Another possible suggestion for Kidlington is *Cytel,* a common O.E. name from O.N. *Ketel.* A possible origin for Mixbury is the personal name *Meoc*; *Meoces dun* occurs in a charter. The name Murren in Newnham Murren may be the personal name *Morwine,* which occurs in a charter (Searle). Play in Play Hatch may be *Pleg-,* the first element of personal names, as Plegmund, Plegbeorht, etc. The first element

of Swinbrook and Swyncombe, judging by some of the early forms, is perhaps a personal name *Swegen*, O.N. *Sveinn*, rather than O.E. *swīn* 'swine.' Taston is perhaps the personal name *Thurstan*, *Thorstan*, O.N. *Þorsteinn*, the terminal having dropped off. The first element of Tusmore may be *Turri* or *Tori*, short forms of *Þored* (*cit.* Searle), rather than *Thōr*. The change from *swu-* to *su-*, as in *Sulung* from *Swulung*, is not a parallel, as Mr Alexander thinks it is, to *Ty-* from *Twi-*, as in Tythrop from **Twiþorp*. Warborough cannot mean 'the fortress where watch was kept,' seeing that the early forms *Weardesburg*, *Weardæs beorh* show the genitive case of the first element. The name probably means 'Ward's grave-mound.' Under Wolvercote it is said that place-names such as Wolverton, Wolvershill, Wolverhampton, 'may have had an influence on the consonant in *Wolgercote*,' i.e. caused *v* to be substituted for *g*. Such an influence is hardly conceivable as being exerted by names in other parts of England. Another possible origin for the first element of Woodlays is O.E. *wiþig*, 'withy,' as in Widford. The change of stress suggested on p. 228, viz. *ofértun* < *owérton* < Worton, is unparalleled, we fancy, and impossible. The initial *w* arose from the over-rounding of the *ō*, resulting in a bilabial continuant practically identical with [w], its formation being perhaps aided by the constant use of the preposition *to* [tu] immediately before the name.

Before concluding, we may be allowed to express the hope that writers on phonology may come to an understanding about the use of the symbols > and <. There has been a fairly well established practice by which > when used between two forms means that the second form developed from the first, while < means that the first form is a development from the second. Mr Alexander, like Professor Wyld, uses these symbols in exactly the reverse sense. In such matters uniformity is of some importance.

W. J. Sedgefield.

Manchester.

Altnordische Namenstudien. By Hans Naumann. (*Acta Germanica.* Neue Reihe. Vol. I.) Berlin: Mayer and Müller. 1912. 195 pp.

In this volume we have a very valuable study of Old Norse personal names embodying the results of studies extending over the whole field of Teutonic personal nomenclature. Dr Naumann sets himself in the first instance to determine those themes in personal names which can be shown to be a common German inheritance, then he deals with those which are common to the North and West Germanic tongues, and finally with those which are exclusively North Germanic and with the very small number of themes found in East or West Germanic alone. He finds about a hundred and thirty-two themes which are common to the three groups, seventy-four compounds of these themes and twenty-seven diminutive forms which are also common. The most interesting of his results in this part of the book is the discovery that there are a great

many themes common to West and North Germanic alone, but no single one which is common to the East and North Germanic groups. This result may be in part due to the comparatively small number of East Germanic names which have been preserved to us; but that will not account for it entirely, and Dr Naumann's researches undoubtedly give support to those who are not prepared to accept without doubt the common grouping of the Germanic tongues, in which East and North Germanic are taken very closely together. In commenting on the list of exclusively North Germanic themes the author rightly lays stress on the characteristic development of names formed from a single theme, in contrast to the more usual compound forms of East and West Germanic and of North Germanic itself in its earlier stages.

In this part of the book it is greatly to be regretted that Dr Naumann was not able to make full use of the very important studies of Dr Björkman on Norse names in Old English documents. Again and again Anglo-Saxon names are quoted which are not Anglo-Saxon at all—*Agemund* (p. 13), *Onlafbeald* (17)—really the name of a Norseman mentioned by Simeon of Durham—, *Earngrim*, *Earncytel* (20), *Ohter* (79)—quoted from the Chronicle, where it is the Anglo-Saxon rendering of the name of a Norse leader—, *Baingiardus* (81), which is certainly not genuine English, *Broder* (84), *Gamalbearn* (88), *Haimerus* (91), *Lagmann* (100), *Lambecarl* (101), *Sumerled* (108), *Winterleda* (113). A few other points may also be raised. The Norse name *Véfótr* can hardly be compared with O.E. *weofod*, at least if it is intended to suggest that there is any parallelism between the second elements of the two words, for the O.E. word goes back to *wīg-bedd* or *wīg-bēod*. The name *Ivo* also is hardly Anglo-Saxon. *Hornung* is not used by itself in A.-S. for 'a bastard' (93); it is an abstract noun, and only found in the compound *hornung-sunu*, child of bastardy. *Folkwalda* (34) and *Starkwulf* (60) should be printed with a *c* instead of a *k*, while *Thuvor* on p. 111 is an evident misprint.

In the second part of the work we have a discussion of particular types of names—pet-names, foreign names, names derived from gods, animals, peoples and heroes, and also some account of the distribution of themes among the various North Germanic dialects. All these chapters alike contain interesting matter and open up important lines of study. In the chapter on the foreign element it may be pointed out that while the common prevalence of *-cytel-* in A.-S. names is of course largely due to Norse influence there can be no question but that the name was also in use in A.-S. itself as evidenced by the common use of the name *Chettle* in later times. In the dialectal distribution of themes perhaps the most interesting form is the prevalence of certain themes in Swedish which are commonly found in East Germanic also. Unfortunately work on dialectal distribution is still severely handicapped by the absence of any complete systematic work on Swedish place-names, such as has been done in Norway and to some extent in Denmark. The book closes with an interesting discussion of the personal names in *Beowulf* showing very clearly that the names, not only of the Swedes and

the Geatas but also those of the Danes, can, almost without exception, be shown to be very definitely of the types in common use in the North Germanic dialects and disproving Kögel's theory that the names of the Danes in that poem are the names of a people belonging to the West Germanic stock.

The author is to be congratulated on the completion of a work in which the amount of detail must have made composition at times an exceedingly laborious work, and on escaping from the danger of being lost in a crowd of detail. He has some very definite results to present.

ALLEN MAWER.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

An Introduction to Old French Phonology and Morphology. By FREDERICK BLISS LUQUIENS. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press; London, Henry Frowde. 1909. 8vo. 147 pp.

'This grammar is intended not only to introduce beginners to the study of Old French Phonology and Morphology from the historical point of view, but also to facilitate their progress to an advanced grammar. The latter aim has governed the arrangement of the book, inasmuch as the author has endeavoured to reproduce, even to the paragraph notation, the arrangement of that advanced grammar which is by most teachers considered the best, the *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen* of Eduard Schwan and Dietrich Behrens.'

In these terms Mr Luquiens defines the purpose of his book and in so doing reveals, it would appear, its inherent defect. To write an Introduction to the study of Old French is difficult enough—for this study is not far removed from its infancy, and the best method of presenting a subject to beginners is necessarily one of the last things to be found out about it—but to combine any such attempt with a simplified presentment of a grammar of the type of the Schwan-Behrens *Grammatik* shows a lack of perception of the nature of the task that is bound to spell failure.

The function of an Introduction to a science is not so much to summarise simply and logically our knowledge of the subject as to indicate to the student the right attitude to his subject, to inculcate the right method of approach and give some intelligent apprehension of the underlying principles. Facts, selected facts, must, indeed, be set forth clearly and succinctly but it is process and development, the how and the why, that should form the staple of the book. The Schwan-Behrens *Grammatik*, however, good as it is in its own way, is obviously a book of quite another type. Planned it was in part for an Introduction but by date and conception it belongs to the earlier period of the study of Old French, the period in which ascertainment of fact was held to be the main object of research. Such a stage is indeed necessary in the history of every science, but it is never final and in this

case the very excellence of the *Grammatik* helped notably to shorten it. Working on the accurate and lucid presentment of facts set forth here and in other excellent grammars of the same type, modern scholars—linguists, phoneticians, psychologists—have pushed on our knowledge of Old French another stage. Empirical knowledge is slowly yielding to scientific, observation of fact leading on to explanation. This advance in knowledge has rendered more possible the writing of a real 'Introduction to Old French,' but it is clear that whoever attempts it must grasp the subject as a whole and not piecemeal, must be in possession of the results of modern scholarship, must look forward and not back.

From a note on page 15 of the Introduction it would appear that Mr Luquiens was not ill equipped on the phonetic side of the task and might have succeeded if he had not attempted to combine two incompatible purposes. 'Every phonological change' he tells us there 'has a cause and a manner.' But he is equally clear that: 'In this grammar we shall deal with neither, except in rare cases: to state the cause of a phonological change is seldom possible (cf. page 11, line 25), to describe the manner would require too much space.' And so, after one detailed description of the manner of one phonetic change, he ends the paragraph with these words: 'Thus we have fully described the manner of the change *ĭ* to *ē*: it is evident that a brief grammar cannot except in rare cases afford space for such description.' A 'brief grammar,' a summary statement of fact, may not indeed be able to afford space for such purposes, but, as we have seen, to an introduction they are essential.

This main defect in the book may best be illustrated by the examination of its presentment of one problem and by the consideration how much help towards its solution the student would obtain. I will take for this purpose a difficult question—that of the history of the *u*-perfect. And first let us hear what Mr Luquiens has to say about it.

In the part of his book dealing with phonetics, we find in § 206 the following note. 'The group consonant + *u* occurs very frequently in the perfect tenses of strong verbs: *abu̯i* (C.L. *hăbŭī*), *abu̯isti*, etc. But its development in these forms is extremely complicated. No definite formula obtains. We can only say that usually the consonant drops out, the *u* then combining in some manner with the preceding vowel: *debu̯it* > *dŭt* (45).' The last half sentence is entirely misleading—*u* certainly does not 'combine' with *e* to make *ü*, and none of the information supplied is very illuminating.

In the morphological section, § 342 (3) merely emphasises the difficulty of the forms, § 404 treats the subject in a superficial and to my mind again misleading fashion. It runs: '§ 404, Strong III. The verbs of this class are all alike as regards their provenience—their perfects all coming from V.L. perfects in *-u̯i*—but from the O.F. standpoint, on account of numerous small differences both in endings and stems, they must be divided into five types. All of these types (except Type 4) differ from Strong I and Strong II, inasmuch as in practically all of their perfect and imperfect subjunctive endings *ü* is present and

in all of them *s* is absent. Type 4 as far as the O.F. forms of case 1100 are concerned might be considered as of Strong I but in provenience and second period development it is of Strong III. Notice that Type 5 is strong (338) only from the standpoint of Vulgar Latin: in Old French it has no stem stressed forms.'

To the student who has only these paragraphs before him the development and forms of the *u*-perfects must indeed offer insuperable difficulty. Yet this need not be so. The history of these perfects is assuredly no easy chapter in the history of the language, it has indeed taken years to work out, but the main lines of the development of their forms stand out now clearly and can be made intelligible to all beginners properly introduced to the subject, i.e. to all those who have found an explanation of some of the commonest linguistic phenomena. Any student who has a firm grip of the processes of 'mutation,' 'assimilation,' 'analogical formation' will find no great difficulty in these perfects. The development of *abụi* over **awi* to *ọi* (by rounding), of *dẹbụi* to *düi* over **dẹwi*, **diwi*[1] (by mutation), **düivi* (by rounding), of *mọvụ̂i* to *müi* over *mọwi*, **müwi* (by mutation)—the carrying over of the mutated vowel of the radical of the 1st persons into the two thirds (**diwet*[1] > **düwet*, **diwerunt* > *düwerunt*, **müwet*, **müwerunt*)—these changes have nothing puzzling for the student with antecedent knowledge of the processes involved. It is obvious that as Mr Luquiens has deliberately ruled out of his scheme all explanation of process the student dependent on his book is non-plussed, for he finds little to help him either here or in other examples of these phenomena. All three—'mutation,' 'assimilation,' 'analogical formation'—are dealt with in a curiously incomplete and even misleading fashion.

'Mutation' is included in the 'Glossary of technical terms,' under the head of 'Umlaut'—'Umlaut: the change of one vowel to another more like a following vowel, for instance cf. 43,' but this definition fails in precision and the examples are confined to the one vowel *ẹ*.

'Assimilation' is mentioned in the glossary but not defined and the note to which we are referred (§ 103, Note ii) deals only with consonant assimilation and so cannot fail to mislead in many cases. The subject of 'Analogy' is dealt with in an equally unsatisfactory manner. The glossary defines 'analogical' in these singularly unhelpful terms: '*Analogical*, used of a linguistic development brought about by the influence of *Analogy* (cf. the second paragraph of 10—11).' And the paragraph referred to treats only of 'contamination' and that inaccurately. It runs: 'The influence of analogy often causes like sounds within like limits of time and space to *develop in different ways* (the italics are mine). For example the early Vulgar Latin word *gravem* became in late Vulgar Latin *grevem*...from analogy with *levem*, with which it had in common the idea of weight.' It would not be easy to give a more incomplete account of one of the most important factors in the development of language.

[1] Cf. N.E. forms *diu*, *diut*, etc.

I have dwelt upon this question of the strong *u*-perfects and the linguistic phenomena involved in their development because they best exhibit what appears to be the radical defect of this book. It must not be inferred, however, that it is an altogether fair sample of the way all questions are treated. On many points Mr Luquiens summarises our present knowledge lucidly and accurately. He has moreover introduced in the arrangement some features that are valuable for the purpose he has in view—notably the glossary of technical terms and the careful tabular presentment of forms of pronouns and verbs[1]. Viewed, in short, not as an introduction to the study of Old French but as an elementary practical grammar the book is not without merit.

MILDRED K. POPE.

OXFORD.

The Oldest Monuments of the French Language. (*The Strasburg Oaths, the Prose of St Eulalie, the Passion of Christ, the Life of St Leger*); *The Life of Saint Alexis.* Translated with Notes. Oxford: J. Thornton. 1912. 8vo. 56 pp.

This book, an anonymous translation of the earliest French texts, claims 'to give an intelligible account (as far as is practicable) of every word in the several texts.' The attempt is not altogether successful. The exact meaning of the text has not always been grasped, while omissions and minor inaccuracies are frequent. This is unfortunate, since the value of such a translation, intended for the use of students of Old French, and especially for beginners, depends on its absolute accuracy.

In the case of the Oldest Monuments, the version is made from the MS. text, and emendations only adopted when the text gives no good sense. Such changes are not, however, as promised in the preface, always recorded in the footnotes. In the *Passion* (11 c 'mantelz, ramiers' for 'palis mantenls,' 25 d 'corps' for 'cor,' 45 b 'si·l conjurat' for 'si conjuret,' 49 d 'fait' for 'fit') and in the *St Leger* (16 d 'sempre·m' for 'sempre,' 31 e 'predier' for 'preier') a number of emendations are assumed without mention; these are usually justifiable, but should have been noted. Among cases of omission, mostly unimportant, may be mentioned that of 'sempre' (*Eulalie*, 5), 'l(i)' in 'no·l soned' (*Pass.*, 54 b), 'i' in 'i visitet' (*Leger*, 30 f); it would also have been instructive to explain the exact force of 'en' in several places where it has been neglected (e.g. *Leger*, 7 e, 11 b, d; cf. *Alex.*, 12 e). The present tense is occasionally rendered by the past (*Pass.*, 50 d 'aiet,' 75 a 'respon,' 106 b 'retornent'), and vice versa (*Leger*, 36 f 'auret'), instead of the corresponding English tense. Certain sentences are cut in two without

[1] The misuse of the symbol > (defined by Mr Luquiens himself as 'becomes') is to be deprecated, however, in cases of analogical formation. *Meus* > *miens*, *cantassemus* > *chantissons*, etc. are simple mis-statements.

necessity, and the construction consequently obscured (e.g. *Pass.*, 21 c, *Leger*, 4 c d; cf. *Alex.*, 103 a b). The following corrections deserve notice: *Oaths*, part 2, l. 1 'the'] '[the]'; *Eul.*, 12 'so Christ commands'] 'and prays to Christ'; *Pass.*, 9 c 'ever'] 'even'; 50 a 'then'] 'thence'; 57 d 'Pilat' is dative; 81 d 'graves of saints'] 'holy graves'; *Leger*, 16 d 'who ever wished me to have [it]'], 'who always wished to have [me]'; 20 b 'tǫit' = 'tost' ('soon'), confused with 'tǫ̊ti'; 28 d 'he has entirely lost them'] 'he has them entirely mutilated.' In the *Passion*, the translation of 101 c is rather forced; better, read with Lücking: 'no·st' for 'vos.' In the *St Leger*, 16 f, 'posci non posc lai vol ester' will give sense—'since I cannot [be] here I wish to be there.' Notes might with advantage have been added to explain alternative meanings of such difficult words as 'dift' or 'dist' (*Oaths*), 'regiel' (*Eul.*, 4), 'se concreidre' (*Eul.*, 11), 'observer' (*Leger*, 23 d), 'roors' (*Leger*, 34 e), etc.; similarly the phrase 'e lo vedent' or 'en lor vedent' (*Pass.*, 118 a), and the place-name 'Lisos' (*Leger*, 17 c), which, though taken by Koschwitz as 'Lisieux,' may well refer to 'Luxeuil' (cf. 'Luxovio' in the Latin version). The use of brackets is not always consistent; single words should be bracketed as additions, *Pass.*, 45 b (him), 103 c (you), *Leger*, 23 d (him), etc.

The translation of the *Life of St Alexis* is based on the critical text of Gaston Paris, while important MS. variants are mentioned in the footnotes. Here again, however, there are occasional inconsistencies, and notes are somewhat sporadic. The following improvements may be suggested: 3 b 'had got'] 'received'; 5 c 'mightily'] 'in perfect faith' (*parfitement*); 12 e 'now do not thou forsake me'] 'if now I do not flee'; 23 b 'makes search for his child'] 'has his child sought for'; 28 e 'comfort herself'] 'behave'; 30 b 'and thus the wife of M. A. spoke indeed'] 'so did the wife of M. A. assuredly'; 36 b 'speak to'] 'pick out'; 37 b 'proof'] 'rumour' (*essample*, cf. *Rol.*, 1016); 45 a 'his son's cry'] 'the appeal in his son's name'; 60 c 'that the city may not go to ruin'] 'that he destroy not the city'; 78 b 'his beard'] 'his white beard'; 89 a 'have heard'] 'have had' (*oi* < *habui*, not *audio*; cf. *Rol.*, 1365); 103 a 'came together'] 'became excited'; 105 b 'seek'] 'will seek' (*querroms*); 107 d 'help'] 'gift' (*mune*). In 28 b the reading 'desperet' < 'dis-parat' is more satisfactory than 'despeiret' < 'de-sperat,' in spite of the support given to the latter reading by L; translate 'she so disarrays it that....' The force of 'par' in 2 b and 'buer' in 90 e is not sufficiently brought out; 'buer i alasses' means 'at a good hour wouldst thou have gone to her.' That of the phrases 'metre el considrer,' 32 a, 49 d ('to resign oneself to'), and 'ne guardent l'oure,' 61 e ('they expect at any hour'), is still less appreciated. The fact that several of these points (32 a 'considrer,' 37 b 'essemple,' 61 e 'ne guardent l'oure,' 89 a 'oi') are carefully explained in the notes to Gaston Paris' edition of 1872, renders such inaccuracies the less excusable.

E. G. R. Waters.

Eastbourne.

The French Procession, a Pageant of great writers. By MARY DUCLAUX (A. MARY F. ROBINSON). London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1909. 8vo. xiii + 358 pp.

The French Ideal. By the same author. London: Chapman and Hall. 1911. 8vo. 312 pp.

Les relations littéraires internationales entrent décidément dans une phase nouvelle. Qu'il faille sortir de chez soi pour juger de la maison du voisin, c'est là un axiome dont la vénérable banalité n'aurait pas d'excuse, si l'expérience ne venait chaque jour nous rappeler la distance qui sépare la théorie de la pratique. (Un Professeur de la Sorbonne n'a-t-il pas jugé opportun, récemment encore, de venir présenter en Angleterre la défense de la poésie française?) Une plus grande sûreté d'érudition, une plus grande souplesse de méthode ont enfin permis à d'excellents esprits d'aborder l'étude des littératures étrangères, dégagés de préventions nationales; qu'il suffise de citer la brillante série d'études sur les écrivains anglais dont s'enorgueillissent les universités françaises. Voici que de ce côté-ci de la Manche, on leur répond, et si, cette fois, MM. les Anglais n'ont pas tiré les premiers, nous n'avons rien perdu pour attendre.

Déjà M. John Bailey[1] nous avait donné une série d'études magistrales sur la poésie française. Mais, en dépit d'une intelligence très fine de certains de nos poètes, M. Bailey semble avoir souffert de la difficulté qu'éprouve maint compatriote de Shakespeare à juger notre grand siècle classique. Son article sur Racine qui lui valut une réponse brillante de M. V. Eccles[2], eut encore l'heureux résultat d'attirer les protestations éloquentes de Mme Duclaux. Au moment même où M. Strachey, dans un petit ouvrage[3] qui est un chef d'œuvre du genre, rendait au poète français un éclatant hommage, dans la préface de sa *French Procession* en quelques pages pleines de finesse et de charme, Mme Duclaux ébauchait la revision du procès Racine. Personne n'était mieux désignée pour la tâche qu'elle entreprend: l'auteur est à la fois, ne l'oublions pas, Miss Mary Robinson et Mme Duclaux. Poète anglais, dont la prose encore toute pénétrée de poésie, vient de fournir une nouvelle raison d'orgueil à la littérature de son pays d'origine, Mme Duclaux est devenue Française par les circonstances de sa vie et par droit de conquête littéraire. Rare combinaison qui relie les admirateurs d'*Hamlet* à ceux d'*Andromaque*. Souhaitons enfin que la magie du vers racinien ne soit plus, hors de France, un de ces enchantements mystérieux, regardé des profanes avec quelqu'étonnement et beaucoup de défiance. Pour eux, Mme Duclaux sera l'initiatrice.

Les sympathies de Mme Duclaux ne sont pas limitées au siècle classique, et dans la *French Procession* elle passe en revue quelques grandes figures du cortège littéraire qui se déroule de la Renaissance à nos jours. A une époque de cavalcades et de 'pageants' la métaphore

[1] *The Claims of French Poetry*, by J. C. Bailey, London 1907.
[2] *The Quarterly Review*, 1909, vol. 2.
[3] *Landmarks of French Literature* in the *Home University Library*. Voir la critique de M. Tilley parue dans cette *Revue* en 1912.

est bien choisie. Mais elle a encore, pour Mme Duclaux, une signification profonde: la littérature d'une nation se présente à elle comme un cortège en marche, où chaque figurant paraît, avec son costume, son allure, son idéal, type dont la physionomie reflète une époque, individu qui résume en lui mille influences secrètes, 'idées, traditions et révoltes.' Ils se suivent dans un défilé perpétuel et le flambeau passe de main en main.

En groupant ainsi une série d'articles, l'auteur s'était réservé le droit de croquer au passage telle silhouette qu'il lui plaisait. Néanmoins il est des omissions comme celle de Montaigne qu'on ne peut s'empêcher de regretter. On souhaiterait qu'un chapitre spécial fût consacré à Flaubert. Sa silhouette gigantesque n'apparaît qu'un instant, derrière celle de George Sand, et encore n'est-elle là que pour faire ressortir par son idéalisme farouche de barbare tatoué, le naturalisme (au sens 'Jean-Jacquien' du mot) de la bonne dame de Nohant. Mme Duclaux a parfois des préférences très marquées, et Flaubert n'est pas le seul à en souffrir: on peut la soupçonner d'avoir un peu négligé Bossuet pour avoir trop aimé Fénelon. Mais ce sont là les petits défauts de grandes qualités et si toutes ces esquisses débordent d'une vie intense, rendons en grâce aux sympathies et aux préférences de leur auteur.

L'amour de la vie dans ses aspects les plus divers explique la variété d'un choix où les Liancourt et les Berthelot voisinnent avec Victor Hugo et Baudelaire. Mme Duclaux nous avait annoncé un cortège 'd'écrivains'; ce ne sont pas tant des auteurs que nous y trouvons, mais bien plutôt des hommes. Leur art n'est, après tout, qu'une manifestation de leur personnalité, et c'est leur personnalité surtout qui doit nous intéresser. Tout artiste qu'elle est, Mme Duclaux ne s'arrête jamais aux questions d'atelier, mais avec une infaillibilité de coup d'œil vraiment 'classique' elle va droit à ce qu'il y a de profondément et d'universellement humain dans son modèle. Il n'est pas un de ses portraits, pas même celui de Voltaire, qui ne contienne le coup de crayon essentiel, suggestif de tout ce qu'un simple croquis ne saurait exprimer.

La 'manière' des portraits est aussi variée que les modèles. On peut grouper ces petites études, comme l'a fait l'auteur, par époques: 'Au lointain'—'Les Romantiques'—'Les fils de la science.' Dans le premier groupe, Ronsard seul représente le XVI^e^ siècle. Vient ensuite Le Roi soleil, précédant son siècle (deux figurants: Racine et Fénelon). Derrière les grandes perruques marche le centenaire Fontenelle, qui rejoint Racine à Voltaire et annonce le règne de la science.

Le XVIII^e^ siècle se distingue plus nettement; la foule y est bigarrée. Avec Rousseau, Laclos et Saint Simon le socialiste (sans parler de Goethe en France) nous arrivons au Romantisme. Chaque époque a sa tonalité propre. Au Romantisme est réservé le bénéfice de la peinture anecdotique, et l'on lit comme un roman où les larmes se mêlent aux sourires, l'histoire du mariage de Victor Hugo et de la folie d'Eugène. Avec Taine et Berthelot nous pénétrons dans un décor où il y a des cornues, dans une atmosphère où flottent les formules positivistes, et

après avoir jeté un regard ému au mysticisme troublant du sceptique Renan, nous aboutissons à la désespérance narquoise de M. Anatole France.

Les arrières-plans contiennent parfois des groupes bien venus, comme celui des Quiétistes, aperçus derrière Fénelon, ou encore, à côté de Taine, celui des Universitaires agités de passions diverses à la nouvelle du Coup d'Etat du 2 décembre. Le personnage principal est en général saisi dans une attitude caractéristique: c'est le Michelet de '48, entre ses deux mariages, à la veille de sa *Révolution*, Taine au sortir de Normale. C'est encore Sainte Beuve, rouquin de vingt-trois ans, timide et laid, à son entrée dans le Cénacle. L'enthousiasme de Mme Duclaux pour les *Lundis* va peut-être un loin, lorsqu'elle les déclare plus durables que les œuvres de G. Sand et de Flaubert. Mais le portrait est charmant, et si dans sa manière de peindre, Mme Duclaux doit quelque chose à Sainte Beuve, on peut dire qu'elle le lui a bien rendu.

La *French Procession* a défilé, un peu rapide, et les commentaires qui signalaient le passage de telle ou telle silhouette connue ont pu faire désirer un arrêt du cortège. Aussi est ce avec plaisir que nous saluons un livre jumeau, *The French Ideal*, dans lequel Mme Duclaux a réuni les portraits plus finis, plus fouillés, de quatre grands écrivains français: Pascal, Fénelon, Buffon et Lamartine. Le titre et le choix des sujets indiquent clairement les intentions de l'auteur: quatre des aspects les plus saillants de l'idéalisme français sont décrits dans son œuvre. Le pragmatisme de Pascal—pour employer la phraséologie suggérée par la dédicace—s'y trouve heureusement complété par le mysticisme théosophique de Fénelon, tandis qu'en face d'eux se dresse le 'naturalisme' de Buffon suivi du romantisme de Lamartine. Le choix de Buffon comme adversaire de Pascal (choix suggéré par Sainte-Beuve) a le grand avantage de nous mener au culte de la Nature, au Romantisme dont il est le grand aïeul. La présence de Lamartine est également significative: la religiosité romantique de notre Shelley français est venu rafraîchir des âmes que le rationalisme voltairien avait desséchées. Invinciblement on pense à la renaissance chrétienne qui inspire nos plus récents poètes, et l'enthousiasme de la jeunesse à l'apparition des 'Harmonies' peut nous aider à comprendre un peu l'étrange émotion que nous éprouvons à la lecture des œuvres de Paul Claudel.

Quelques lignes très nettes suffisent à Mme Duclaux pour marquer la position métaphysique de ces quatre grands représentants de l'art français. Mme Duclaux ne s'arrête pas dans les généralités. Son rôle et sa méthode sont ceux d'un psychologue et nous descendons vite dans les choses. Il s'agit d'expliquer la pensée des auteurs par leurs tempéraments, et leurs tempéraments, autant que faire se peut, par leur milieu, etc. (voir, non pas Taine, mais Sainte-Beuve). La méthode a ses dangers, et après avoir suivi Pascal d'Auvergne à Port Royal, à travers ses périodes mondaines et ses conversions, après l'avoir rencontré en compagnie de Méré, de Descartes et d'Arnaud, nous sentons que nous n'avons pas pénétré assez loin dans cette âme, que nous sommes restés dans le vestibule de sa pensée. Nous avons vécu à ses côtés, parmi ses

contemporains, mais précisément comme ses contemporains, nous avons vu trop de l'homme et pas assez du philosophe. Un peu plus de recul, et les observations fines et justes dont est rempli le chapitre sur Pascal prendraient un relief qui leur manque.

Dérangeons à dessein l'ordre chronologique respecté par Mme Duclaux et mettons en face de l'ascète passionné et maladif, Buffon, 'le corps d'un athlète et l'âme d'un sage' ainsi que disait Voltaire. Nous le voyons se promenant 'comme un dieu' dans son Jardin des Plantes. Ce jardin prend une place importante dans l'étude de Mme Duclaux, comme il l'avait dans la vie du naturaliste. Ce jardin, Buffon l'appelait son fils aîné; l'autre fils, 'Buffonet' devait être sacrifié, dans sa vie et dans sa mort, aux exigences et à la gloire du grand frère. Il y a là plus qu'une manière piquante de présenter les choses. Le jardin botanique nous aide à comprendre comment, grand prêtre de la déesse Nature, dont il chante l'unité divine, M. de Buffon fut à la fois le précurseur de l'évolutionisme et l'aïeul des Romantiques.

Entre les quatre articles, on n'hésite pas à donner la palme à celui qui dans le livre tient la place la plus importante: c'est sans doute qu'en parlant de Fénelon, Mme Duclaux se sent en complète sympathie avec son sujet. Déjà une ébauche, dans le livre précédent, nous avait laissé entrevoir à quel point l'auteur goûtait et pénétrait les écrits du doux archevêque. L'atmosphère de mysticisme aristocratique qui entourait Fénelon est admirablement évoqué par Mme Duclaux: la société des Beauvilliers et des Chevreuses, Mme Guyon et ses fidèles revivent à nos yeux, avec toute la noblesse édifiante de leurs caractères—toute la poétique beauté de leur religion. Dans la querelle du Quiétisme, on sent où vont les préférences de Mme Duclaux. Peut-être le sent-on trop, et les admirateurs de Bossuet invoquant la souplesse un peu féline de son adversaire, secoueront la tête devant un Fénelon nimbé de l'auréole des saints. Peu importe, Mme Duclaux a su pénétrer les arcanes de cette âme un peu mystérieuse et sans en ignorer *complètement* les faiblesses, elle a su nous donner de ses précieuses qualités un tableau plein de charme et de vie.

On se demande souvent si la critique peut être un art créateur, et même jusqu'à quel point elle mérite le nom d'*art*. A ces questions Mme Duclaux a donné une éloquente réponse. Ses articles seront utiles à l'étudiant qui y trouvera en même temps qu'une critique fructueuse des beautés (la plus difficile de toutes), une analyse psychologique très personnelle et très suggestive du tempérament des auteurs. Ils seront encore un régal pour tous ceux que la beauté de forme ne laisse pas indifférents. Le style est de qualité rare: tantôt, grave et nombreux, il se déroule sans raideur; tantôt subtil et spirituel jusqu'à l'audace, il éclate en formules heureuses, en ces cliquetis de mots qui ponctuent la pensée[1]. C'est un style varié, très coloré et très vivant;

[1] Quelques exemples:

Under Louis XIV, in that reign of One-ness.
Didot, the publisher-in-law of Bernardin de S. Pierre.
Fénelon, other-worldly rather than unworldly.

et partout le charme insaisissable d'une mélodie qui attire et qui retient.

Les deux livres ornés de reproductions de gravures bien choisies, sont dignes par l'impression[1] et la reliure, des bibliothèques les plus exclusives. Le second contient devant chaque article (sauf pour Buffon[2]) une bibliographie sommaire.

E. Fannière.

Oxford.

Goethes Gespräche. Begründet von Woldemar von Biedermann. Neu herausgegeben von Flodoard von Biedermann. 5 vols. Leipzig: F. W. von Biedermann. 1909–1911. 8vo. xii + 555; 669; 520; 495; xviii + 507 pp.

The publication of the conversations of great men has not infrequently been denounced as an act of impiety. Quintilian blames the compilers of Cicero's *Dicta* for their want of prudence in selecting their collection, and there are still many well-meaning, if narrow, minds, to whom the editor of Luther's *Table Talk* appears guilty of deplorable indiscretion. No such accusation could possibly be raised against the editor of Goethe's *Gespräche*; for, although everything authentic is included in a collection like the present, there are very few conversations in which the poet does not appear great and amiable.

When the first edition of this valuable compilation appeared, it was warmly applauded as bringing together much inaccessible matter. In the present edition the number of conversations has been doubled, although it must be confessed the new items are not always of the first importance. Amongst the most interesting additions are Soret's diaries, reproduced here for the first time in their original French, from the manuscript copy preserved in the Weimar Archiv. In this, as well as in the collections of the Kanzler von Müller, Falk, Eckermann and others we are inclined to question the wisdom of dividing them up to suit the chronological arrangement of the present work. The exact chronological order of these conversations is not a matter on which much weight should be laid, and surely the personality of the interlocutor, which is lost sight of here, counts for something. This is particularly evident in the case of Eckermann whose *Gespräche* must always occupy the first place in such a collection. Eckermann has received his full share of praise and censure. Herr von Biedermann joins the chorus of his detractors; he accuses him of negligence in his dates, and considers him generally untrustworthy. Eckermann never, however, aimed at complete accuracy, and never intended to furnish a stenographically correct report of his daily conversations with Goethe. No one has vindicated his method more successfully than Dr Houben in his recent

[1] Les erreurs typographiques sont nombreuses dans les citations françaises des deux livres.

[2] Pourquoi? Mme Duclaux ne s'est elle pas servie des études de Faguet, de Quatrefages et de Nadault de Buffon?

edition of the *Gespräche*; and it is to be regretted that Herr von Biedermann did not take the opportunity of discussing that editor's arguments in his introduction. Dr Houben shows plainly that Eckermann worked as a productive artist, distributing and arranging his material in order to produce a lifelike picture of his beloved master.

We feel inclined to go a step further than Dr Houben and to look into the origin of Eckermann's motives and principles of composition. He arrived at Weimar when Goethe had entered the last stage of his career as a writer, and was engaged on his life-story, *Dichtung und Wahrheit*; he became Goethe's assistant, and out of the autobiographical atmosphere pervading the master's study the plan of the *Gespräche* was no doubt born. In his record of Goethe's conversations he proceeded on the lines that are implied in Goethe's use, in the title of his autobiography, of 'Dichtung,' the word meaning there, not the deliberate perversion of the truth, but the artistic selection, composition and arrangement of the facts. Thus Eckermann avoids glaring effects, passes over unpleasant events, such as family and other quarrels, and he makes effective use of contrast and preparatory exposition; he often chooses the place of a conversation in order to supply it with a suitable background[1].

Eckermann, it is true, was too little of the artist to attain a high measure of success with his method, but it is a mistake to deal with his work as if it were a mere chronicle of daily events. He seems himself to have anticipated the dangers to which his book would be exposed at the hands of future editors; for his son, probably acting in accordance with his father's wishes, stipulated with Brockhaus the publisher that the work should be preserved in its original form, lest its accuracy be impaired and its character destroyed, 'das Werk in seiner Ursprünglichkeit zu erhalten und es durch keinerlei Umarbeitung in seiner Wahrheit abzuschwächen' (Houben, p. 658). Contemporaries able to form a competent judgment are practically unanimous in the opinion that Eckermann succeeded in the task he attempted, namely to depict Goethe, the man as he lived, and worked, and suffered. The words of Kanzler von Müller to this effect have been repeatedly quoted. We add a few utterances of members of Goethe's family which have been preserved by Mrs Anna Jameson, the intimate friend of Ottilie von Goethe. Speaking of the first part of Eckermann's *Gespräche*, which had then just appeared, she says: 'When I left Weimar, it was not yet published. There my attention was strongly directed to this book, not so much by the interest as by the *kind* of interest it had excited around me. I remember one of Goethe's grandsons turning over the

[1] Goethe's words uttered in respect of his visit to Bodmer are of considerable interest in this connexion: 'Überhaupt zwar finde ich nicht ganz schicklich, dass Reisende einen bedeutenden Mann, den sie besuchen, gleichsam signalisieren, als wenn sie Stoff zu einem Steckbrief geben wollten. Niemand bedenkt, dass es eigentlich nur ein Augenblick ist, wo er, vorgetreten, neugierig beobachtet und doch nur auf seine eigene Weise; und so kann der Besuchte bald wirklich, bald scheinbar als stolz oder demütig, als schweigsam oder gesprächig, als heiter oder verdriesslich scheinen.' (*Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Buch 18.)

leaves as it lay on my table, and exclaiming with animation—"Es ist der Grosspapa selbst! da lebt er!—da spricht er!" Another, habitually intimate with the domestic life of Goethe [von Müller?], said with emotion—"Es ist das buch von liebe und wahrheit." "Whatever may be in that book," said a dear friend of mine [Ottilie], when she placed it in my hands, "I would pledge myself beforehand for its truth. The mind of Eckermann, at once unsullied and unruffled by all contact with the world, is so constituted, that he could not perceive or speak other than the truth, any more than a perfectly clear and smooth mirror could reflect a false or a distorted image[1]."

"Eckermann's book" said she [Ottilie, probably in a letter], "is the purest altar that has yet been erected to the fame of Goethe. In times like these, when the feeling of reverence (Pietat) [*sic*] seems to be fast departing, when a young author of talent takes the pen, as a sort of critical dissecting-knife, mangling and prying where once he trembled and adored; when his first endeavour is to fling down that heaviest burthen upon the soul of an egotist—the burthen of admiration for the merits of another, is it not pleasant to meet with such a book as this? And when everything one reads is so artificial, *so gemacht*, so impertinent, is it not delightful to open a book where in every page we feel the pulse-throb of a warm, true heart? I do not know if I am right, but it seems to me that those who cannot admire, can have nothing in themselves to be admired; then how worthy of admiration must that man be, who thus throws down his whole heart and soul in admiration before the feet of another! the simplicity of this entire abnegation of self lends to it a certain dignity. There is nothing here but truth and love—for Goethe loved Eckermann, and O! how Eckermann loved Goethe!

"I can have no critical judgment here, and ought not to have; I can only bear witness to the general truth of the whole—nothing could be truer. I cannot be, like you, struck and charmed by particular passages. I was too long a sort of Lady High Treasurer to be dazzled or astonished now that the caskets are opened. I greet the gems as old acquaintance"' (*l. c.*, pp. 231, 2).

In his introduction, Herr von Biedermann quotes with approval a remark of Gustav von Loeper to the effect that this collection of conversations is the most beautiful biography of Goethe imaginable. Such a statement seems somewhat to exaggerate the importance of the volumes before us, as it would require more than the genius of a Boswell to work these disconnected fragments into anything like a complete and satisfactory life. In the first place, they are far too unevenly distributed over the poet's lifetime. All the large collections were, for obvious reasons, compiled during the second half of Goethe's career; and on turning to the volumes of the present edition, we find that the first contains all known conversations down to 1808, these consisting, during the first forty years, largely of brief and occasional

[1] *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada*, by Mrs Jameson. 3 vols. London, 1838; vol. I, pp. 173, 4.

notices only. From 1805 onwards, however, the bulk of the conversations increases rapidly. The second volume covers fifteen years, the period from 1808 to 1823, the third comprises the next five years, and the fourth the remaining four years. Thus, the young Goethe is very inadequately represented. We realise from the fragmentary entries taken from Lavater's diaries how much we have missed, and we feel a keen disappointment when we find Jacobi referring to the Düsseldorf visit with the tantalising remark, 'seine Tafelreden hätte ich aufzuzeichnen gewünscht' (No. 71).

Only in later years do the conversations become really valuable for biographical purposes. For here, speaking in the presence of mostly sympathetic and admiring interlocutors, Goethe puts aside much of the reserve characteristic of his later letters and diaries. As the years advanced, the number and variety of people seeking an interview with the celebrated poet increase. Almost all classes, professions and nationalities are represented, and it is surprising to see how wide is the scope of his interests, and how he always contrives to find a topic of conversation suited to the station and profession of his visitor.

There is another aspect in which the collection is seriously deficient: those who were most closely associated with Goethe observe an almost complete silence with regard to their conversations with him. Not merely the companions of his youth have nothing to tell us; but poets and thinkers like Herder, Wieland and Schiller are equally silent; so, too, are Wilhelm von Humboldt, the Schlegels, Schopenhauer. Intimate friends, the Duke, Frau von Stein, and the two men in whom Goethe placed unreserved confidence, Meyer and Zelter, maintain the same reticence. The few records of their intercourse with him that have been garnered by subsequent editors are mere chance fragments. And our regret grows the more intense when we are told by these very friends how overpowering the impressions were that his speech made upon them. Herder, in 1786, remarks, 'Er ist in seiner Naturforschung der freieste, gründlichste, reinste Geist, den ich als Beobachter kennen gelernt habe, ein wahres *exemplar humanae naturae* in diesem Fache, dessen Umgang mein Trost ist, und dessen Gespräche jedesmal meine Seele erweitern' (No. 261).

Varnhagen von Ense expresses himself in a similar strain: '[Das Gespräch] war wie ein Stück Leben, in tausend Wellen fliessend, ein Gefühl im ganzen wirkend, ohne die einzelnen Bezüge gesondert festhalten zu lassen; jedes Wort eine Blüte am Zweige des Baums, aus der tiefen dunkeln Wurzel her, aber selber doch nur als luftig heitres Gebild des Augenblickes erschlossen....Schwer würde ich einige besondere Sprüche aus dem lebensreichen Ganzen aussondern; die festesten, kräftigsten Äusserungen, die feinsten, erfreulichsten Wendungen, voll Gestalt im Hervorkommen, zerflossen mir unter den Händen, wie ich sie dem Gedächtnisse zum Behalten und Überliefern einprägen wollte' (No. 1817).

This latter quotation also provides one reason, at least, why Goethe's most intimate friends did not record what they had listened to: his

speech made too deep an impression. And the following words by Johanna Frommann (No. 1820) no doubt accounted for the silence of many: 'Du wärst zufrieden gewesen mit dem, was er sagte, aber nachsagen kann man's besser mal mündlich, als schriftlich, nicht weil's verfänglich wäre, sondern weil einem kaum gefällt, was man ihm nachsagt, wiel weniger nachschreibt.'

Another, and perhaps the most powerful reason of all for reticence was the feeling that words spoken in friendship were purely personal property, and should not be profaned by being made public. If this was the sentiment of friends and comrades, how much more sacred must Goethe's conversation have been to his relatives. Mrs Jameson, in the book we have already quoted, tells us that Ottilie, 'was pressed by arguments and splendid offers of emolument to give to the world the domestic life of the poet, or at least to contribute some notes with regard to his private conversations and opinions. She refused at once and decidedly. "I had," said she, "several reasons for this. In the first place, I have not a good memory, and I have a very lively imagination: I could not always trust myself. What I should say would be something very near the truth, and very like the truth, but would it be *the truth*? How could I send into the world a book, of the exact truth of which I could not in my own conscience, and to my own conviction, be assured? A second reason was, that Goethe did not die young; I could not do him any justice he was unable to do himself, by telling the world what he *would* have done, what he *could* have done, or what he intended to do, if time had been given. He lived long enough to accomplish his own fame. He told the world all he chose the world to know; and if not, is it for me—for *me*!—to fill up the vacancy, by telling what, perhaps, he never meant to be told?—what I owed to his boundless love and confidence?—*that* were too horrible!"' (p. 179 f.).

We have several times taken occasion to praise the compiler of this 'Gesamtausgabe' for his diligence in collecting material; but the same cannot, unfortunately, be said of his editing. There are far too many misprints, especially in the French and English passages which would have been all the better for a revision by competent proof-readers. Not all the mistakes are as entertaining as the mutilated quotation from Horace, which reads: 'Sic te *dira* potens Cypri...' (II. 552). Copious indices are added to the fifth volume, and neither are these without serious defects. Although we have made no systematic examination of their accuracy, we have found many omissions and mis-statements. A few instances are given:

Vol. v. p. 378[a] Koethe II. 359, omitted; p. 418[b] Kabale und Liebe I. 386 (the drama is not mentioned on the page indicated); p. 450[b], line 2, read 288 for 208; p. 457[a] Geschichte, add II. 585; p. 472[a] Tabak, add II. 488, 600; p. 480[b] Stolz, read II. 421 for II. 420; p. 481[b] add references to 'Balladen,' IV. 228, 230; p. 482[a] 'Der Edelknabe und die Müllerin,' omit IV. 398, which refers to 'Der Junggeselle und der Mühlbach,' and should be entered in its proper place; p. 484[a] Der Fischer, add II. 385;

p. 484[b] Der Gott und die Bajadere, II. 500(?); p. 486[b] Der untreue Knabe, III. 248(?).

In the text itself we do not see the necessity of the note of exclamation added by the editor to 'Den Morgen war ich zum Tee bei die(!) Stein eingeladen' (No. 330). There is nothing remarkable in this construction. The accusative after 'bei,' expressing direction, is found in Central German sources, in Luther's language, in Klopstock and Goethe, and may be heard in the colloquial speech of educated speakers at the present day. The editor further places a query after 'ägyptisch-babylonische Grillen' (No. 413); but is it not clear that the expression refers to the stories contained in Genesis and other historical writings of the Old Testament?

We will not, however, close with a note of discord. In spite of faults—often inevitable in a compendious work of this nature—the collection can be heartily recommended to all lovers and students of Goethe. It is a highly valuable, nay indispensable, complement to the Weimar edition. We confidently expect that a new edition will soon be called for; and it is chiefly in the hope of this that attention is drawn to blemishes that may easily be removed.

HEINRICH MUTSCHMANN.

NOTTINGHAM.

Dantis Alagherii Operum Latinorum Concordantiae. Ediderunt E. K. RAND et E. H. WILKINS. Oxonii, e Prelo Clarendoniano. MDCCCCXII. Roy. 8vo. viii + 577 pp.

Concordanza delle Rime di Francesco Petrarca. Compilata da K. MCKENZIE. Oxford, della Stamperia dell' Università. 1912. Roy. 8vo. xvi + 519 pp.

The Cambridge (U.S.A.) Dante Society is to be congratulated on the completion of their series of Concordances to the works of Dante. It is now just on a quarter of a century since the first volume, Dr Fay's valuable *Concordance to the Divina Commedia* (Boston, U.S.A., 1888), was published. This was followed, seventeen years later, by the *Concordanza delle Opere Italiane in Prosa e del Canzoniere di Dante* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1905), edited by E. S. Sheldon and A. White, which was noticed in this *Review* at the time of publication. The present volume, which, like its immediate predecessor, is issued from the Clarendon Press, comprises the whole of the Latin works of Dante. The text followed is that of the *Oxford Dante*, but a certain number of variants from critical editions of several of the separate works (*e.g.* from Rajna's *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, Albini's *Eclogae*, Barbi's *Vita Nuova*, and Shadwell's *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*) have been included, with cross-references to the Oxford text. Further, by the courtesy of Dr Moore, editor of the *Oxford Dante*, a few emendations which have been decided upon since the publication of the last edition of that work have been embodied in the Concordance.

As in the case of the Concordance to Dante's minor Italian works, the method adopted is the 'dictionary method,' all verbal forms being registered under the first person singular of the present indicative, and all substantival and adjectival forms under the nominative (masculine) singular. The objections to this arrangement were set forth in the article on the Italian Concordance referred to above, consequently they need not be repeated on this occasion. Suffice it to say that a pretty wide practical experience of both methods has not led us to abandon our preference for the more usual concordance arrangement, whereby every separate part of verb, substantive, or adjective, is registered under a heading of its own. By the adoption of their own chosen method the compilers have been betrayed apparently into what may be described as an interesting blunder on their part; unless, indeed, which in the circumstances seems hardly probable, we are to regard it as a deliberate expression of opinion on a very knotty point. *Argis*, in the sentence 'ex quo scilicet Argis hospitalitas a Phrygibus denegata' (*Epist.* v. l. 129), is registered under *Argus*. What does this word stand for? The word is familiar, of course, as the name of the hundred-eyed son of Agenor, but there can be no possible question of Argus Panoptes in the present passage. *Argis* properly should be the locative of *Argi*, 'at Argos.' But, as the present writer has shown in a recent number of this *Review* (Vol. VII, p. 221, n. 1), this is an interpretation which for several reasons it is very difficult to accept here. Our own view is that the correct reading is not *denegata* but *derogata* (see *M. L. R., loc. cit.*), and that *Argis* is the dative of *Argi*, in the sense of *Argivi*, the Greeks. Though there appears to be no classical instance of the use of *Argi* in this sense, such a use was certainly current in the Middle Ages; and, moreover, it is recorded in a work with which Dante was familiar, namely the *Magnae Derivationes* of Uguccione da Pisa. Uguccione says: '*Argos* nomen civitatis in Grecia, neutri generis et indeclinabile in singulari, sed in plurali masculini generis, et declinatur *Argi, -orum*, unde dicti sunt *Argi*, vel ab *Argo* rege dicuntur.' Similarly Papias, in his *Elementarium Doctrinae Rudimentum*, had said 150 years earlier: '*Argi* graece et *argiui* dicti ab argo rege filio apis. Iidem *danai* a danao rege. Iidem quoque *argolici* ab argo.' Were the compilers of the Concordance aware of this fact? We doubt it, and have little hesitation in assuming that they unconsciously coined the word to fit the interpretation of the passage given (ignorantly) by most of the translators of the letter. In view of the difficulties involved it would be preferable to give the non-committal *Argi* as the head-word in the Concordance, and thus leave the interpretation open.

The compilers are not always consistent in their method. For example, *agens* is given as a separate article, besides figuring several times under *ago*; while the instances of *patiens* are registered under *patior* only. The indication, by italicising the reference-numbers, of the passages in which words like *cum, quod, si, licet*, are constructed with the subjunctive can hardly be said to fall within the province of

a Concordance. The work, which has been compiled and printed with very great accuracy (we had noted a few misprints, but found them included in the *Corrigenda* at the end of the volume), cannot fail to be of great value to Dantists, especially to those who are desirous of making a study of Dante's Latinity, an interesting subject to which too little attention has as yet been paid. We trust that the energies and resources of the American Dante Society are not yet exhausted. Much yet remains to be done. For instance, a general subject index to the whole of Dante's works, Italian and Latin, is sorely needed. Such a work could well be produced by the system of collaboration which has worked so successfully in the case of this and of the previous Concordance; and it would be a fitting crown to the labours of the devoted band of American scholars to whom students of Dante all the world over are already so deeply indebted.

The Petrarch Concordance, which appears to be due to the single-handed labours of Mr Kenneth McKenzie, is uniform in appearance and arrangement with the volume just noticed, and so far as we have been able to judge, it is not inferior in accuracy. There being no standard edition of Petrarch's *Rime*, Mr McKenzie had to make his own selection from among the various available texts. He decided in favour of that of Salvo-Cozzo for the *Canzoniere*, and that of Carl Appel for the *Trionfi*, probably in the circumstances the best choice he could have made. The work, which has evidently been a labour of love, has been carefully planned, but it is not free from objectionable features. The most noticeable of these are the preference given to obsolete spellings over the recognised modern standard orthography (*e.g. dilecto* for *diletto*, *gratia* for *grazia*, *philosopho* for *filosofo*, and so on); and the disconcerting discrepancies in a great number of instances between the word-forms in the headings, and those in the actual quotations (thus, under *Enone* one finds, not that word, but *Oenone*; under *Eraclito*, *Heraclito*; under *Teseo*, *Theseo*; under *profitto*, *profecto*; under *inesorabile*, *inexorabile*; etc., etc.). Such anomalies, which have no apparent *raison d'être*, and are peculiarly out of place in a work of this kind, cannot fail to be a hindrance to rapid reference, which is the first *desideratum* in a concordance. It is regrettable that the usefulness of a valuable and laborious piece of work should have been diminished by perversities of this description.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

BURNHAM, BUCKS.

El Romancero Español. Conferencias dadas en la Columbia University de New York. Por RAMÓN MENÉNDEZ PIDAL. New York: The Hispanic Society of America. 1910. 131 pp.

The first lecture is entitled *El Romancero, sus orígenes y carácter*; the second, *El Romancero, su transmisión a la época moderna.*

In the first, D. Ramón Menéndez Pidal to some extent repeats what

he has explained at greater length in his work on the *Infantes de Lara*, and while there is much that is additional and fresh, there is not quite the same interest of discovery which marks the second lecture. This is a document in the history of ballad poetry such as many students have desired without much hope that it would ever be possible. What it records is the discovery of Castilian ballad poetry in living oral tradition, both at home in the peninsula and abroad in the colonies, and especially among the Spanish Jews of Morocco and the Levant. It is like the story of Scott's raids into Liddesdale for the *Border Minstrelsy*, or like E. T. Kristensen's recovery of the old Danish ballads in the tradition of West Jutland. Only, in these recent Spanish acquisitions the fields are much wider, and the story consequently more exciting. All at once, apparently, in Chile and Peru, in Tangier, Rhodes and Adrianople, in Castile itself, the *romances* which had escaped notice began to be heard, and in a very short time, beginning about 1900, a great number of oral ballads were added to the contents of the *Romancero*.

These new-found *romances* are mostly not of the type which is commonly regarded as proper to Castile, and which is so well described in the first of these two lectures—the ballad which is a fragment of an earlier epic, concerned with the history of Castile and with a Castilian hero—e.g. Fernán González, or the Infantes de Lara, or the Cid. Those Castilian heroic ballads are unlike the popular ballads which are most widely diffused in other countries—the ballads of which Mr Andrew Lang wrote so well and whose motives he understood so thoroughly—ballads like *May Colvin, Binnorie, Babylon, Le Roi Renaud, La Biche Blanche*. The strange thing about Castile was that its own strong heroic tradition seemed to have discouraged the simpler kind of lyrical ballad which is happily common in other parts of Spain, according to the studies so admirably summarised and explained by Gaston Paris in dealing with the ballads of Piedmont. The ballads of the North of Italy are part of a stock belonging also to France, to Catalonia, to Portugal—but with this the Castilian *romancero* had little to do. The other nations could not be expected to trouble themselves about the house of Lara or the Cid, and, till quite lately, it looked as if the popular tradition of France and Piedmont, Catalonia and Portugal, had been rejected in Castile through the predominance there of another, viz. the epic fashion of popular poetry. It is true that there were some Castilian versions corresponding to the vague and unhistorical ballad themes of other countries—romances with no trace of the epic:

> ¡ Quién hubiese tal ventura sobre las aguas del mar
> Como hubo el conde Arnaldos, la mañana de San Juan !

But there was not in Castilian anything like the plenty of such things to be found elsewhere, e.g. in the *Romancerillo catalan* of Milá y Fontanals. The reason appeared to be obvious and convenient. Catalonia had no epic, and so for its ballad poetry it had to live on the common stock, which is generally allowed to be French, and which has

no peculiar national quality but passes easily from one dialect to another. Castile had its *cantares de gesta*, and the *romances* which are descended from the *cantares* kept out the other sort of popular ballad. This is clear and rational; but it turns out to be not exactly true. The same things were repeated in Castile as in the neighbouring countries, along with the *romances* which were the property of Castile alone.

The account given by Sr. Menéndez Pidal of his own discoveries ought to be known to every lover of ballads, particularly his story of the children's songs which he heard in Montevideo, and the ballads sung by the washerwoman at Osma in May 1900. This last passage is one of remarkable beauty, and its value for history is not small.

'En Mayo de 1900 hacía yo una larga excursión por las orillas del Duero, para estudiar la geografía del Cantar de Mio Cid. Acabada la indagación en Osma, y deteniendome allí un día más para presenciar el eclipse solar que iba á sobrevenir, ocurriósele á mi mujer (era aquel nuestro viaje de recién casados) recitar el romance del Conde Sol á una lavandera con quien hablábamos. La buena mujer nos dijo que lo sabía ella también, con otros muchos que eran el repertorio de su canto acompañado del batir la ropa en el río; y en seguida, complaciente, se puso á cantarnos uno, con una voz dulce y una sonada que á nuestros oidos era tan "apacible y agradable" como aquellas que oía el historiador Mariana con los romances del cerco de Zamora. El romance que cantaba nos era desconocido, por eso más interesante; y á medida que avanzaba, mi mujer creía reconocer en él un relato casi histórico, un eco tardío de aquel "dolor tribulación y desventura" que, al decir de los cronistas, causó en toda España la muerte del principe Don Juan, hijo de los Reyes Católicos. Y en efecto, estudiado después, aquel era un romance histórico del siglo xv, desconocido á todas las colecciones antiguas y modernas de España. Era preciso, en las pocas horas que nos quedaban de estancia en Osma, anotar aquella música y copiar aquellos romances, primer tributo que Castilla pagaba al romancero tradicional moderno; y ayudados del maestro de capilla de la catedral, haciendo á la buena mujer repetir sus cantos, se nos pasaron las horas sin tiempo apenas para contemplar el eclipse que entonces ocurría, y que habiéndonos retenido allí, ya poco significaba para nosotros.' (pp. 100, 101.)

It is pleasant to consider whether this is more like Cervantes or like Scott: and how Scott would have enjoyed it.

The most remarkable thing in these new discoveries is what regards the ballads of the Spanish Jews in exile. The Jews were expelled by Ferdinand and Isabella in 1492; they have not only kept the Castilian language but also the Castilian ballads, including some which have been lost to the popular tradition at home: 'Notable es que Los Infantes de Lara, el Cid y Portocarrero sean cantados en Rodas, en Orán, y en Tánger, cuando no lo son ya en Burgos ó en Andalucía.'

One problem is left, as to which we would gladly have more information from a student who has given us so much. This is nothing less than the old question of the minstrel and his relation to ballad poetry. Is one to make a sharp distinction between the epic recited by a minstrel or *juglar* and the choral ballad? Is the Castilian *romance* of the strictly Castilian order to be regarded as a ballad along with the lyrical choral ballads such as girls sing at their play? Those new discoveries which are described in this book are not only texts of ballads, they are tunes also, and a crowd of facts about the way in which ballads are sung. In Spain the ancient fashion of the *carole* has

not died out; apart from the children's games there are 'las danzas corales de los labradores'' (p. 104). There are two separate types of lyrical ballad in Castile. One is descended from the early epics (*cantares de gesta*) and like the *cantares* belonged first of all to the minstrels—at any rate, depended on the minstrels for publication and currency. The other is of the choral fashion common throughout most countries in the middle ages—the true popular ballad, sung by dancers. The distinction seems to be a sound one. But the choral ballad easily may do without the chorus and the dance; it is remembered afterwards by women at their work, and it is touching to find in this book how the ballads in Spain are used for their ancient purpose by 'the spinsters and the knitters in the sun,' and by the washerwomen at the river. The epic recitation of the minstrel and the choral ballad of the dance may come to resemble one another more and more through this sort of popular tradition. Yet originally they are distinct, and deal in different kinds of story. So it may be said, and it seems probable. The value of this distinction, however, is not great if it is left abstract, and there is much to be done in detail before the character of the wonderful ballad poetry of Spain can be thoroughly understood in all its varieties.

The book has waited too long for this inadequate review, which yet may call the attention of some northern students to these new treasures of poetry and of learning.

W. P. Ker.

London.

Il Milione di Marco Polo. A cura di Dante Olivieri. (*Scrittori d' Italia*, xxx.) Bari: G. Laterza e Figli. 8vo. 317 pp.

Le Novelle di Matteo Bandello. A cura di Gioachino Brognoligo. (Same Series, ii, v, ix, xvii, xxiii) 424, 446, 486, 496 and 382 pp.

Le Scelta delle Lettere Familiari di Giuseppe Baretti. A cura di Luigi Piccioni. (Same Series, xxvi) 460 pp.

Opere di Giovanni Berchet. A cura di Egidio Bellorini. (Same Series, xviii, xxvii) 438 and 254 pp.

There is certainly no falling off either in the rate of publication or in the quality of the volumes of this series. In a previous notice attention was called to the high standard of printing and editing of this collection. The magnitude of the undertaking, far from damping the enthusiasm of the editor and of the publishers, seems to act as a stimulant to increasing industry and daring. Not only works of first-rate importance in Italian literature are reprinted, but also a number of writings which are often overlooked or forgotten; so that when the whole collection is complete we shall have a truly representative series. Remembering former disappointments, we should perhaps have preferred to see the undertaking begin on a less ambitious scale, and grow steadily as it gained in favour, to greater comprehensiveness. There

appears however to be no justification for such scepticism, seeing that the volumes are following one another at diminishing intervals.

We may be allowed to express our hope that too much energy is not spent on minor works to the detriment of more important ones. We fully appreciate the difficulties inherent in the reissue of some classics on which general attention is focussed; but for an editor commanding the services of such an army of specialists, such difficulties should be anything but insuperable. Meanwhile the comprehensive character of the series compels the reviewer, even if he is unable to keep pace with the publishing, to discuss in one article works of very different times and very dissimilar styles. As an illustration of the wide range covered by the series we propose to pass in review here the reprints of writings belonging to the fourteenth, sixteenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Everyone is conversant with that wonderful book of travel which Marco Polo dictated to Rusticiano of Pisa while both were prisoners of war in Genoa, between 1298 and 1299. Rusticiano wrote out the adventures of his friend in the rather peculiar French, full of Italianisms, that many of his countrymen affected during the thirteenth century, thus drawing upon themselves Dante's fierce denunciation in *Convivio* I, 10. This text, however corrupt, is still the fundamental one, and was rendered familiar to Englishmen by Colonel Henry Yule[1]. Polo seems to have himself revised it after his return to Venice, and a goodly number of more or less differentiated versions in Italian are to be found in manuscript. One of these versions was printed by Bartoli[2], whereas the present editor, Dr Olivieri, has attempted to reconstruct the translation according to what he assumes to be its original form. Whoever is acquainted with the great differences between the MSS., some of which offer condensed texts, while others preserve texts that have been expanded by later and independent additions, will easily understand that Signor Olivieri has set himself an almost hopeless task. He has been compelled to add a number of variants, while omitting to record the less significant ones. He was perhaps well advised in this peculiar case to avoid bigotry with regard to the usual standards of textual criticism, and not to heed the all too obvious remonstrances which are sure to be made by dissatisfied critics. As the original French text is extant and as the Italian version cannot be regarded as an important specimen of prose, the departure from the usual methods of editing may be warranted, though we should emphatically deprecate such a departure in any other case. It would be easy to point out some passages in which Signor Olivieri's reconstruction is open to criticism; but such suggestions would certainly not be better founded than those he makes; on the whole, he seems to us to have been very successful in his attempt. His concluding note is careful, clear and modest.

The *Milione*, which was so widely read during the fourteenth century, may be taken to represent that new spirit of adventure which

[1] *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, London, Murray, 1871.
[2] *I Viaggi di Marco Polo*, a cura di Adolfo Bartoli, Florence, 1863.

rose to its highest point in the age of geographical discovery. A humbler, at times satirical and at times merely frolicsome intention prompted the writers of *novelle*. With the exception of those included in the *Decameron*, no collection is so significant, so far reaching and so instructive as that composed by Matteo Bandello, a much travelled monk, a bishop and, above all, a born *novellatore*. It is impossible to understand fully the Italian Cinquecento without being familiar with these stories. Their importance and that of their short prefaces cannot be overrated. An amazing amount of information has already been gathered from them, and no doubt some gleanings are still to be picked up. In recent years considerable attention has been devoted to Bandello. This is the second complete edition of his *Novelle* issued in this century. Only one story is to be found in an original MS.; another MS., which also contains only one story, has no great authority. Consequently all editors are forced to reproduce the first three sections from the original edition of Lucca, 1554, and the fourth section from the edition of Lyons, 1573. Both however are marred by quite a number of misprints and even of unwarranted editorial corrections; these, which increased enormously in later reprints, have, we are glad to say, been carefully expunged from this reissue, in which, too, Bandello's peculiar orthography is preserved.

Bandello wrote in the full tide of the Renaissance. Baretti was one of the first writers, and not the least important, to promote a wholesome reaction against the literature of Arcadia—so melodious and so barren. Baretti's name is not unknown to the historian of English literature, but he can only be assigned his proper place by measuring his influence on Italian literature. For many years his fame has been based principally on the *Frusta letteraria*; and not until quite recently has he been made the subject of the careful study he deserves. His scattered writings have been collected, and rare books by him like this 'Scelta' have been reprinted. This is an exceedingly interesting work. In the Middle Ages letter-writing was a difficult and laborious art, and it was thought necessary to compose special treatises providing specimens of letters suited to the most ordinary occasions; and Baretti was clearly of opinion that Italians had not increased their proficiency as letter-writers in the eighteenth century. An English publisher asked him to edit an anthology of Italian letters for the use of English readers. Baretti disapproved of the flourished classic style of the Renaissance writers and he felt that criticism alone was inadequate to express his full condemnation of the style of his time. So, without much ado and with considerable assurance, he decided to collect some of his own letters and to write some new ones for this special object. He ascribed the authorship of these letters to several of his friends, and finally published the bulk of them under these fictitious names. The letters may appear to us strongly coloured by Baretti's stylistic peculiarities; we may consider them to be no less artificial in their affected use of colloquialisms and of Tuscan idioms than were in their author's opinion the well rounded missives of sixteenth-century writers;

nevertheless they give us a most useful insight into the character and views of this restless Piedmontese. They are no vacuous rhetorical exercises; even in those which he wrote for this 'Scelta,' he contrived to vent his opinions—and very outspoken opinions they were—on every subject under the sun. They ought, in this careful reprint, for which we are indebted to Dr Piccioni, to be of peculiar interest to the student of the eighteenth century as well as entertaining to the general reader. In some ways Baretti may be regarded as one of the forerunners of the Romantic movement in Italy; he advocated the rise of writers more learned, more catholic in their literary taste, more independent of time-honoured models. But in other ways he was bitterly opposed to the group of young men, who met together in the 'Accademia dei Pugni,' or, a little later, gathered round the periodical *Il Caffè*, and had fallen completely under the spell of the French encyclopaedists. He fought for an innovation of the literary language, which should bring it nearer to colloquial Italian; they, on their part, pretended to be entirely indifferent to style and language, and very often evinced their disregard for them by employing the most objectionable and useless gallicisms. Following on the publication of the 'Frusta' a series of literary battles began, which did not end until the classic-romantic feud was settled and forgotten. But the literary strife was so entangled with purely political matters, that many a critic failed to discriminate the different elements which composed it. Few of the general public had or have the opportunity of looking up the old periodicals in which these furious battles were waged, so that many fundamentally wrong ideas have been fostered and spread. It took time to discover the real continuity of the process of literary evolution amidst such incessant changes. Only lately has it been realised that the Risorgimento was in itself a highly interesting historical period and that it is incumbent on our generation to study it carefully, before the documents bearing on it are lost and dispersed. A number of writings have been reprinted and with the help of this fresh material, it has been comparatively easy to acquire a better and more sympathetic understanding of the period. The controversy about Romanticism was principally fought out in the numbers of another Milanese periodical *Il Conciliatore*; and one of its most active contributors, and most energetic editors, was Giovanni Berchet, the same Berchet who in the early days of the Risorgimento took up with his odes the part which was filled by Mameli in 1848 and 1849. Between them they share the honour of having provided Italian patriots with the stimulus of inspired poetry, an element so difficult to estimate and so often underrated by modern fact-bound historians. Signor Bellorini has bestowed on the works of Berchet many years of study and research, so that he has been in the position to make an entirely reliable collection of the prose writings and the poems of his author. Among the prose works which were hitherto hidden away in the dusty pages of the *Conciliatore*, there are brilliant essays, humorous discussions and shorter articles. The 'Lettera semi-seria di Grisostomo,' the paper 'Del criterio ne' discorsi' and a number of others are among the most illuminating

expositions of the tenets of the Italian Romanticists. There are, however, also reviews and brief notices which aim merely at acquainting the readers with foreign literature; and these are no doubt often superficial. Berchet was not a profound critic, just as he was not a deeply meditative poet. He was the first translator of *The Vicar of Wakefield*; and his poems were published four times (between 1824 and 1830) by Richard Taylor of London, facts which have a special interest for English students of Italian literature. Yet only this reprint and another recent one[1] are complete. Signor Bellorini has divided the poems in five groups, having regard to their previous publication. Such an arrangement is open to criticism, and we cannot say that we find sufficient reasons for it. But rather than lay stress on this point, we should like to call attention to the care shown by Dr Bellorini in tracing unpublished poems and in providing the reader with full bibliographical references. The brief editorial notes at the end of the volumes are models of unpretentious but sound and uncontroversial criticism. Dr Bellorini has already explained how it came to pass that he included a Milanese sonnet (p. 416) among these poems, without realizing that it was known to have been written by Carlo Porta; this is hardly a blemish in a book that is well worthy of the series in which it appears.

CESARE FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

The Legend of the Holy Fina Virgin of San Geminiano. Now first translated from the Trecento Italian of Fra GIOVANNI COPPO, with introduction and Notes by M. MANSFIELD. (*The New Medieval Library*, VI.) London: Chatto and Windus. 1908. 8vo. xlv + 127 pp.

The Book of the Divine Consolation of the Blessed Angela da Foligno. Translated from the Italian by MARY G. STEGMAN, with an Introduction by ALGAR THOROLD. (Same Series, V.) London: Chatto and Windus. 1909. xliv + 265 pp.

In the writings of the mystics and in the lives of saints there is often to be found a directness and an emotional power greater and nobler than in works more widely known, and more generally recognised by literary historians. Our age is so interested in primitive literature that both these booklets, though varying widely in character, can hardly fail to attract the attention of sympathetic readers. The holy Fina is in many ways the more fortunate of these two saints. Her life was short and simple; her biography is charming in its simplicity, and so modest in its extent that there has been room here to print the rare Italian text of Fra Giovanni Coppo along with the translation. There are also full notes and a long introduction. The translation is

[1] *Le Poesie originali e tradotte di Giovanni Berchet*, a cura di G. Targioni-Tozzetti, Florence, Sansoni, 1907.

remarkably accurate, and successfully reproduces the spirit of the Italian prose. We have only detected one or two slight misunderstandings. The Italian text, on the other hand, might have been edited more carefully; but, in a book of this kind, it would be invidious to lay excessive stress on minute points, especially when so much labour has been bestowed on the introduction and the notes. Among the most pleasing features of the book are the reproductions of some beautiful frescos which were inspired by the life of the saint. The first of these by Lippo Memmi comes nearest to the spirit of Fina; and those by Gozzoli and Ghirlandaio are a joy to the eye.

The blessed Angela had not such good fortune as to be remembered by great painters; Mezzastris, whose portrait of her is reproduced here, cannot aspire to such rank. The book is adorned by some interesting woodcuts taken from a very scarce edition of 1536. The very length of *The Divine Consolation* has stood in the way of the Italian text being reprinted; but it would have been welcome, if only for the reason that the dearth of information concerning Angela's life has prevented the editor from giving us a more searching and precise introduction. This lack of information is the more to be regretted, because we seem, in the autobiographical pages of the *Consolation*, to hear an echo of a real tragedy of the soul, of hard-fought battles, of bitter trials, defeats and final victories.

C. Foligno.

Oxford.

The Baskish Verb. A Parsing Synopsis of the 788 Forms of the Verb in St Luke's Gospel, from Leiçarraga's New Testament of the Year 1571. By E. S. Dodgson. London: Henry Frowde. 1912. 8vo. 200 pp.

Two qualifications are essential for the production of such a work as this—complete mastery over the intricacies of Basque verbal-flexions, and an intimate knowledge of Leiçarraga. Both these Mr Dodgson possesses in an eminent degree, and the result is a book of far-reaching usefulness to those students who feel disposed to take up the study of ecclesiastical Basque, this being the most correct form of the language and Leiçarraga's New Testament of 1571 the best specimen of it obtainable. Mr Dodgson's book is a very complete and comprehensive piece of sound scholarship and he may justly regard it with pride and satisfaction. In the matter of externals, he has been well served by his publisher.

The author is evidently a martyr to accuracy, ready to break a lance over a wrong accent or other typographical blemish, which, as every page shows, he has done his best to eliminate. That he has not reached the stage of absolute perfection, either in Basque or English orthography is apparent; yet it would scarcely be just on our part to emphasise insignificant errors of detail which in no way detract from the scholarly

character of the book, and to overlook its outstanding merits, as Dr Linschmann has done in the *Literarisches Zentralblatt*, where he himself adds unconsciously to the errors he detects.

To popularise a difficult subject like Basque grammar is not an easy matter, and we doubt if Mr Dodgson's study will awaken that interest which it is his object to attract. The patient care and enthusiasm which he brings to his work deserve success, although the technical nature of the subject, and the absence of information of a popular character will restrict the circulation of the book considerably. Its chief shortcoming is the ignorance it displays of Basque philology, an ignorance which results from the deficiencies of his knowledge concerning the origin of the Basque language and the Indian family of speech to which it belongs. Hence the author's discoveries of Basque words in Mexican, Peruvian, and other non-Indian tongues must be taken with a grain of salt. We have long been convinced that the subject of Basque etymology, as well as that of prehistoric man in Europe, is a closed field to any but those versed in Kolarian comparative philology. Apart from such defects, the student of Basque will learn much from a perusal of this Synopsis, and find that, after all, the Basque language is not so difficult to understand and acquire as is commonly supposed.

W. J. Edmondston-Scott.

Edinburgh.

MINOR NOTICES.

In the series of 'Shakespeare Classics' Dr Rouse edits the *Menaechmi*, the Latin text with the Elizabethan translation by Warner, in illustration of Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* (Chatto and Windus, 1912). The translation was published in 1595, but had been circulated in manuscript earlier. There is no clear evidence, however, that Shakespeare was acquainted with it when he wrote his comedy, the date of which may probably be as early as 1590. The only verbal parallel is in the expression 'he makes me a stale and a laughing-stock' as a translation of 'ludibrio habeor,' where Shakespeare has 'poor I am but his stale,' and here, if there is any borrowing, Warner may have been the borrower. The editor calls attention to the freedom of the translation generally and the additional liveliness which the translator imparts to the dialogue. In the Elizabethan edition the more notable variations are marked sometimes by an asterisk. Dr Rouse also compares Shakespeare's play with the original, and shews how a touch of pathos was added to what was a mere farce, by the character and

position of Ægeon, and how much more varied and amusing the play was made by the creation of the two Dromios. The pages both of the Latin and the English text are agreeably headed by words selected by the editor to indicate the progress of the story, 'Facinus luculentum,' 'Quis est?' 'Elecebrae argentariae,' 'Alium non me,' 'Etiam derides,' 'Uxori eloquar,' 'Tu, tu,' 'Nimis iracunde,' 'Elleboro opus est,' and so on, with corresponding phrases for the English. The volume is very attractive and readable.

As a contribution to the history of the English Novel Miss Charlotte E. Morgan's monograph *The Rise of the Novel of Manners* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1911) is a very sound piece of work. It is, in fact, an attempt to trace the history of English prose fiction between 1600 and 1740, just stopping short of Richardson. It consists of two main parts, history and bibliography, and while the former is of considerable interest, the latter may be said to be indispensable to serious students of the subject, forming as it does almost a complete record of the output of fiction year after year during the period dealt with. Most people will be surprised to find how large this was, and also what a considerable part was played by women, even at this early period, in the production of it. In the earlier portion of her work the author traces the displacement of the Italian *novelle*, in the first half of the seventeenth century, by the long sentimental romances based upon French models, and then the transition from these romances to the idealistic novel of manners; and she notes the development on the one hand of stories of intrigue and of what may be called 'narrative comedies,' and on the other of the realism of emotional detail, especially in the translations and imitations of the famous *Letters of a Portuguese Nun*. Finally in the early years of the eighteenth century sentimental and didactic tendencies manifested themselves more and more definitely, and at the same time a strong bent towards realism began to characterise fiction. Meanwhile rapid progress was being made in the development of style and structure, and the character sketch was perfected in the *Spectator*. The names of Bunyan, of Addison and of Swift are connected, no doubt, in various ways with the development of the novel, but apart from Defoe the actual purveyors of current fiction both in the earlier and the later period, were for the most part women, Aphra Behn, Mary Manley, Eliza Haywood, Jane Barker, Penelope Aubin; and this fact, which is well brought out by Miss Morgan, has hardly been sufficiently recognised hitherto. Another fact which is very clearly illustrated by the bibliography, is the large part played in this field of literature by translations, especially from the French.

Under a title which will not convey any meaning to the ordinary reader we have here from Mr Vilhelm Bladin a dissertation (*Studies of Denominative Verbs in English*, Almquist and Wiksell, Uppsala, 1911), which is both useful and interesting. The subject of the author's investigation is the tendency, more pronounced in English than in any

other language, to turn nouns into verbs, and the various meanings and uses of the verbs thus formed. The process is one that has been going on throughout the history of the language, but it has been specially developed in modern times, not so much because of the absence to a great extent of inflexional suffixes (for quite enough of these remain to establish distinctions), as in accordance with the traditional flexibility of the forms of speech, based upon the national determination to use language mainly for the practical purpose of clear and vigorous expression, whether in poetry or prose, and not to submit to any academical dictation. The author of this dissertation has collected, chiefly from the *New English Dictionary*, but also to some extent from modern journalism and colloquial speech, a large number of illustrative examples. He endeavours also to analyse the process and to classify his examples under various heads. In this he is not wholly successful, and we do not altogether like his terminology. The application of the term 'semological oscillation' is hardly justified on pp. 22—31, and though the terms 'de-subjective' and 'de-objective' as applied to noun verbs mark a real and important distinction, they cannot be said to be very happily chosen. This however does not much affect the interest of his examples and quotations, for which as we have said, and as he amply acknowledges, he is mainly indebted to the Oxford Dictionary.

G. C. M.

Many a University, in Italy and elsewhere, would be proud to possess the noble series of books set forth in the *Catalogue of the Dante Collection in the Library of University College, London, with a note on the Correspondence of Henry Clark Barlow* (Oxford: printed for University College, London, 1910). The list has been drawn up with the utmost skill by R. W. Chambers, the Librarian of the College; while the printing and general appearance of the volume reflect great credit on the Oxford Press. As is well known, the nucleus of the collection was formed by Dr Barlow, who also endowed the Dante Lectures that bear his name. Additions were made at various times by Prof. James Morris, Mr F. D. Mocatta, Dr Whitley Stokes, and by an anonymous benefactor who is designated as R. We have used the book for some time and have had ample opportunity of testing the accuracy of the numerous entries (which occupy 142 pages); not once have we detected the smallest error. Though the collection does not, of course, pretend to the completeness achieved by a few others, it has been formed with much discrimination and lacks very few books of real consequence; while the number of treasures it contains, in the way of early and rare editions of the poet and of books dealing with the man and his work, is truly remarkable. The correspondence, some interesting specimens of which are given, includes letters addressed to Dr Barlow by Ferrazzi, Emiliani-Giudici, Seymour Kirkup, Frederic Madden, C. E. Norton, A. Torri, Carl Witte and others.

H. O.

The two most recent volumes on German subjects in the series of *Columbia University Germanic Studies*, Dr A. W. Porterfield's *Karl Leberecht Immermann, A Study in German Romanticism*, and Dr Elsie W. Helmrich's *History of the Chorus in the German Drama* (Columbia University Press, 1911, 1912), maintain the high standard of academic work of that series. Dr Porterfield's study might have been more aptly entitled 'Immermann in his relations to Romanticism,' the post-Romantic aspects of Immermann's work being very briefly treated, and that from the negative standpoint of what the author calls 'anti-Romanticism.' But the book is an able and suggestive study of the Romantic side of Immermann's genius and of his relations to the Romantic writers, which distinctly furthers our knowledge of an author who is too little read and appreciated now-a-days. His book, moreover, is a pleasure to read, although we are inclined to take exception to his fondness for German methods of 'statistical' criticism and to his frequent introduction of comparisons drawn from contemporary literature (Hauptmann, Sudermann). Miss Helmrich has cast her net as widely as she well could cast it, including the choral element in the mediæval Church drama at the one end of her story and the Wagnerian music-drama at the other end, a proceeding somewhat open to criticism. Her chapter on the seventeenth century drama strikes us as most satisfactory. The use of the chorus in the eighteenth century, sporadic as it is, would, however, have repaid a more careful study on comparative lines. The author has nothing to say, for instance, of the example of the Italian dramatists, which, if we are not mistaken, was more significant than that of Racine's *Athalie*.

Another American academic dissertation reaches us from the University of California, *Rousseaus Einfluss auf Klinger*, by F. A. Wyneken (University of California Press, Berkeley). This is a careful study, which sets out from the generally, and rightly accepted basis that Klinger was profoundly influenced by Rousseau; and on this assumption it is a useful supplement to existing Klinger literature. Had, however, Dr Wyneken first to prove his thesis, he might not have been justified in some of his arguments. The contrast, for instance, of 'Herz' and 'Verstand'—no doubt in Klinger's case, to be traced to Rousseau—is plentifully represented in the pre-Rousseau German literature; and the 'joy of grief' is even less typically and exclusively Rousseauish. Has Dr Wyneken forgotten how Gellert wept 'mit einer Art von süsser Wehmuth' over *Clarissa* and *Sir Charles Grandison*?

J. G. R.

We do not think Professor O. E. Lessing, who is one of the foremost workers in the field of German literary study in America, has been well-advised in publishing this volume on *Masters in Modern German Literature* (Dresden, Reissner, 1912). The book is not only published in Germany, but is also written in an extraordinary German-English, which effectually debars it from being read with any pleasure by readers whose mother-tongue is English. The matter of the book is quite

excellent, without to any considerable extent breaking fresh ground critically—it contains a series of essays on Liliencron, Dehmel, Hauptmann, Holz and the brothers Mann—but here again the point of view and the method of treatment have so little that is American or Anglo-Saxon about them, are so completely focussed to German eyes, that one wonders again why the author should have chosen English as his medium.

J. G. R.

In my review of Mr Wright's *History of French Literature* in the last number of the *Modern Language Review* (p. 127) I assumed that the author had devoted a quarter of his work to the consideration of Old French Literature; the actual proportion is, however, about one-seventh, 122 pages out of 878.

H. O.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

December, 1912—February, 1913.

GENERAL.

Busse, C., Geschichte der Weltliteratur. II. Band. Bielefeld, Velhagen und Klasing. 16 M.

Haslinghuis, E. J., De duivel in het drama der middeleeuwen. (Proefschrift, Univ. Leiden.) Leiden, Gebr. van der Hoek. 1 fl. 60.

Hettner, H., Literaturgeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts. 6 vols. Vols. I—II, 7th ed.; Vols. III—VI, 6th ed. Brunswick, Vieweg. 40 M.

Passy, P., Petite phonétique comparée des principales langues européennes. 2e éd. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M.

Strang, W., Imagination and Fancy. Being the John Oliver Hobbes memorial essay, 1912. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 1s. net.

Studien zur Literaturgeschichte. A. Köster zum 7. 11. 1912 überreicht. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 9 M.

Thurau, G., Singen und Sagen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des dichterischen Ausdrucks. Berlin, Weidmann. 4 M.

Walzel, O., Leben, Erleben und Dichten. Ein Versuch. Leipzig, Haessel. 1 M. 20.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

General.

Bibliotheca Romanica. 161. Chateaubriand, René. 162.—164. G. Bruno, Candelaio. 165.—167. A. de Musset, Théâtre (Barberine, Lorenzaccio). Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each no. 40 pf.

Gauchat, L. et Jeanjaquet, Glossaire des patois de la Suisse romande. Bibliographie linguistique de la Suisse romande. Tome I. Paris, H. Champion. 7 fr. 50.

Giubbini, A., Victor Hugo e Giosuè Carducci, come poeti della storia. Perugia, G. Guerra. 3 L.

Schneegans, H., Studium und Unterricht der romanischen Philologie. Beiträge. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 60.

Italian.

Aubel, E., N. Tommaseo, poeta, con una introduzione sulla vita e sulla opere. Città di Castello, Lapi. 2 L.

Barbiera, R., I poeti italiani del secolo XIX. Antologia, con proemio, biografie, note e ritratti. Milan, Treves. 10 L.

Bassermann, A., Orme di Dante in Italia. Traduzione di E. Gorra. Bologna, Zanichelli. 3 L. 50.

Bellatreccia, B., Manifestazioni spiritiste intorno al cattolicismo di Dante nelle sue relazioni con Dio e con la civile società, per cura di E. Celani. (Collezione di opuscoli danteschi inediti o rari, 119—120.) Città di Castello, Lapi. 1 L. 60.

Bettinelli, S., Le 'Raccolte' con il 'Parere' dei Granelleschi e la 'Riposta' di G. Gozzi, a cura di P. Tommasini-Mattiucci. (Collezione di opuscoli danteschi inediti o rari, 116—118.) Città di Castello, Lapi. 2 L. 40.

Bindoni, G., Sull' inno 'La risurrezione' di A. Manzoni. Treviso, L. Zoppelli. 1 L. 50.

Boccalini, T., Ragguagli di Parnaso e Pietra del paragone politico, a cura di G. Rua. Vol. II. (Scrittori d' Italia, xxxix.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Carducci, G., Letture del risorgimento italiano, scelte e ordinate (1749—1870). Bologna, Zanichelli. 3 L.

Caro, A., Opere, a cura di V. Turri. Vol. I. (Scrittori d' Italia, xli.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Commedie del Cinquecento, a cura di I. Sanesi. Vol. II. (Scrittori d' Italia, xxxviii.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Cuoco, V., Saggio storico sulla rivoluzione napoletana del 1799, a cura di F. Nicolini. (Scrittori d' Italia, xliii.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Dante Alighieri, La Divine Comédie, L'Enfer, trad. et notes de L. Espinasse-Mongenet, préface de C. Maurras. Paris, Nouv. libr. nationale. 5 fr.

Dante's Monarchie. Übersetzt und erklärt von C. Sauter. Freiburg, Herder. 4 M. 50.

Donati, A., Poeti minori del Settecento: Mazza, Rezzonico, Fiorentino, Bondi, Cassoli, Mascheroni. (Scrittori d' Italia, xlv.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Dubreton, J., La disgrace de N. Machiavel. Florence (1469–1527). Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Federico, G., L' opera letteraria di S. Bettinelli (1718–1808). Milan, Soc. Editr. Dante Alighieri. 3 L.

Foscolo, O., Prose, a cura di V. Cian. Vol. I. (Scrittori d' Italia, xlii.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Gardner, E. G., Dante and the Mystics. A study of the mystical aspect of the Divina Commedia and its relations with some of its mediæval sources. London, Dent. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Gnoli, D., I poeti della scuola romana (1850–70). (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, lxiii.) Bari, Laterza. 4 L.

Gröber, G., Über die Quellen von Boccaccios Dekameron. (Einführung in die romanischen Klassiker, I.) Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. 1 M. 50.

Locella, M., Dantes Francesca da Rimini in der Literatur, bildenden Kunst und Musik. Esslingen, Neff. 10 M.

Maugain, G., Boileau et l'Italie. (Bibl. de l'Institut français de Florence, II, 3.) Paris, H. Champion, 2 fr.

Metastasio, P., Opere, a cura di F. Nicolini. Vol. I. (Scrittori d' Italia, xliv.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Mignon, M., Études de littérature italienne. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Moretti, M., I poemetti di Marino. Con prefazione di Vamba. Rome, Tip. Editr. Nazionale. 3 L. 50.

Novellieri minori del Cinquecento (G. Parabosco e S. Erizzo), a cura di G. Gigli e F. Nicolini. (Scrittori d' Italia, xl.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Paggi, S., Il 'Cicerone' di G. C. Passeroni. Città di Castello, Lapi. 4 L.

Passerini, G. L., Il vocabolario della prosa dannunziana. Florence, Sansoni. 5 L.

Pecciarini, E., A. Cesari autore delle Giunte veronesi e Delle bellezze della Divina Commedia. Florence, Ramella. 4 L.

Pellegrini, C., Luigi Pulci. L' uomo e l' artista. Pisa, Spoerri. 5 L.

Persico, T., Gli scrittori politici napoletani dal 1400 al 1700. (Nuova biblioteca di letteratura, storia ed arte, VI.) Naples, Perrella. 5 L.

Ruggeri, P., Poesie in dialetto bergamesco inedite e sparse, a cura di A. Mazzoleni. Bergamo, C. Conti. 2 L. 50.

Sainati, A., La lirica di T. Tasso. Parte I. Pisa, Spoerri. 8 L.

Smith, W., The Commedia dell' Arte. A Study in Italian popular Comedy. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature.) Columbia, Univ. Press (London, H. Frowde). 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Tommaseo, N., Canti popolari illirici a cura di D. Bulferelli. Libr. editr. milanese. 5 L.

Vitaliani, D., Carlo Ridolfi, pittore e scrittore, con documenti inediti. Turin, G. Schoder. 6 L.

Provenzal.

Canzoniere provenzale, Il, della Biblioteca Ambrosiana R. 71. Sup. Ed. diplomatica preceduta da un' introduzione a cura di G. Bertoni. (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, X, 1.) Halle, Niemeyer. 18 M.

Morf, H., Vom Ursprung der provenzalischen Schriftsprache. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften.') Berlin, G. Reimer. 1 M.

Uc de Saint-Circ, Poésies, publ. avec introduction, traduction et notes par A. Jeanroy et J. J. Salverda de Grave. (Bibl. méridionale, Première série, Tome XV.) Toulouse, Privat. 6 fr.

Spanish.

Bonilla y San Martin, A., Libro del esforçado cavallero Don Tristan de Leonis y de sus grandes fechos en armas. (Valladolid, 1501.) Madrid, Fortanet. 18 pes.

Gonzalez Blanco, E., Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, su vida y su obra. Madrid, Sucessores de Hernando. 2 pes.

Lope de Vega Carpio, Las Burlas Veras. Comedia famosa. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by S. L. Millard Rosenberg. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania.) Philadelphia.

San Juan de la Cruz, Obras. Edición critica, con introducciones y notas del P. Gerardo de San Juan de la Cruz y un epílogo de M. Menéndez y Pelayo. Tome I. Toledo, Palaez. 6 pes.

French.

(*a*) *General (incl. Linguistic).*

Gilliéron J. et M. Roques, Études de géographie linguistique d'après l'atlas linguistique de la France. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Bueve de Hantone, Der festländische. Fassung II. Nach allen Handschriften herausgegeben von A. Stimming. I. Band. Text. (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, X, 3.) Halle, Niemeyer. 28 M.

Chanson de Roland, La, poème de Théroulde, précédé d'une étude par L. Vitet et suivi des chroniques de Turpin. Paris, E. Flammarion. 95 c.

Gutersohn, C., Die Balduin-Episode des altfranzösischen Ogier-Epos. Düsseldorf, A. Bagel. 1 M. 50.

Romanz, Li, d'Athis et Prophilias. (L'estoire d'Athènes.) Nach allen Handschriften herausg. von A. Hilka. I. Band. (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, x, 2.) Halle, Niemeyer. 14 M.

Vaillant, E., Les origines de la chanson française. La langue d'oïl. Les trouvères. Chansons inédites de Gauthier d'Argies, trouvère picard du XIII^e siècle. Paris, A. Messein. 3 fr. 50.

Voretzsch, C., Einführung in das Studium der altfranzösischen Literatur. 2. Aufl. (Sammlung kurzer Lehrbücher der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, II.) Halle, Niemeyer. 7 M.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Allais, G., Les harmonies de Lamartine, nouvelles études. Paris, Soc. fr. d'impr. et de libr. 1 fr. 50.

Balzac, H. de, Critique littéraire, introd. de L. Lumet. (Bibl. des Critiques.) Paris, A. Messein. 7 fr. 50.

Balzac, H. de, La Comédie humaine, éd. par M. Bouteron et H. Longnon. Tome V—VII. Paris, L. Conard. Each 9 fr.

Bayle, P., Pensées diverses sur la comète, édition critique, publ. par A. Prat. Tome II. Paris, E. Cornély. 6 fr.

Bertel, C., Jules de Rességuier. Ein französischer Frühromantiker. Vienna, A. Hölder. 4 kr. 75.

Boutard, C., Lamennais, sa vie et ses doctrines. Tome III. Paris, Perrin. 5 fr.

Brébeuf, G. de, Entretiens solitaires, édition critique, publ. par R. Harmand. Paris, E. Cornély. 6 fr.

Brunetière, F., Histoire de la littérature française classique. Tome III. Paris, Delagrave. 7 fr. 50.

Charlier, G., Le sentiment de la nature chez les romantiques français. Paris, Fontemoing. 7 fr. 50.

Des Cognets, J., La vie intérieure de Lamartine, d'après les souvenirs de J. M. Dargand. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Du Bellay, J., Œuvres poétiques, édition critique, publ. par H. Chamard. Tome III. Paris, E. Cornély. 3 fr. 50.

Fach, T., Die Naturschilderung bei Charles Nodier. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, VI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Faguet, É., Rousseau artiste. Paris, Soc. fr. d'impr. et de libr. 3 fr. 50.

Ferrère, E. L., Le dictionnaire des idées reçues, texte établi d'après le manuscrit original de G. Flaubert. Paris, L. Conard. 3 fr. 50.

Ferrère, E. L., L'esthétique de G. Flaubert. Paris, L. Conard. 7 fr. 50.

Henriot, É., À quoi rêvent les jeunes gens. Enquête sur la jeunesse littéraire. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr.

Hermant, A., Essais de critique. Paris, B. Grasset. 3 fr. 50.

Jourdain, E. F., An Introduction to the French Classical Drama. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6*s.* net.

Karl, L., Un moraliste bourbonnais de XIV^e siècle et son œuvre. Le Roman de Mandevie et les mélancolies de J. Dupin. Paris, H. Champion.

Ladoué, P., Un précurseur du romantisme. Millevoye, 1782–1816. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

Lancaster, H. C., Pierre du Ryer, Dramatist. Washington, D. C., Carnegie Institution.

Lanson, G., Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française moderne Tome iv. Paris, Hachette. 8 fr.

Latreille, C., Victor de Laprade. Paris, H. Champion. 7 fr. 50.

Levertin, O., Fransk litteraturhistoria. i. Renässansen. Stockholm, Bonnier. 4 kr.

Masson, F., L'Académie française, 1629–1793. Paris, P. Ollendorff. 7 fr. 50.

Montaigne, Essais. Reproduction en phototypie de l'exemplaire avec notes manuscrits appartenant à la ville de Bordeaux, publ. par F. Strowsky. 3 vols. Paris, Hachette. 300 fr.

Rimbaud, A., Œuvres. Vers et proses, rev. et annotées par P. Berrichon. Paris, Mercure de France. 7 fr.

Roche, L., La vie de Jean la Fontaine. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 3 fr. 50.

Samain, A., Œuvres complètes. Tome iv. Paris, Mercure de France. 12 fr.

Sattler, H., H. de Balzacs Roman 'La peau de chagrin.' (Beiträge zur Geschichte der romanischen Sprachen und Literaturen, v.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

Searles, C., Catalogue de tous les Livres de feu M. Chapelain. (Leland Stanford Junior University Publications.) Stanford University, California.

Senancour, De, Obermann, édition critique, publ. par G. Michaut. Paris, E. Cornély. 5 fr.

Thibaudet, A., La poésie de S. Mallarmé, étude littéraire. Paris, Édit. de la Nouvelle Revue Française. 10 fr.

Tournoux, G. A., Bibliographie verlainienne, contribution critique à l'étude des littératures étrangères et comparées. Paris, Tournoux. 9 fr. 50.

Turquet-Milnes, G., The Influence of Baudelaire in France and England. London, Constable. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Verlaine, P., Œuvres poétiques, publ. par G. A. Tournoux. Paris, Tournoux. 15 fr.

Wilmotte, M., La culture française en Belgique. Paris, H. Champion. 3 fr. 50.

Wurzbach, W. von, Geschichte des französischen Romans. i. Band. (Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, ii, ii, 1.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 7 M.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

General.

Helm, K., Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte. i. Band. (Germanische Bibliothek, i. Abt., v. Reihe, ii.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 6 M. 40.

Loewe, R., Germanic Philology. Transl. by J. D. Jones. London, G. Allen. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lütjens, A., Herzog Friedrich von der Normandie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen und schwedischen Literatur des Mittelalters. (Münchener Archiv für Philologie des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, ii.) Munich, Callwey. 4 M.

Scandinavian.

Björnson, B., Gro-Tid. Brev fra Aarene 1857–70. Utgit av H. Koht. Kristiania, Gyldendal. 12 kr.

Bull, J. B., H. Wergeland. Kristiania, Steenske Forlag. 5 kr.

Folkeviser, Danmarks gamle. Danske Ridderviser. Efter Forarbejder af S. Grundtvig udg. af A. Olrik. iii, 3. Copenhagen, Wroblewski. 2 kr.

Hartmann, J. W., The Gongu-Hrolfssaga : a Study in Old Norse Philology. (Columbia University Germanic Studies.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Krogvig, A., Nordisk digtning. Studier og kritikker. Christiania, Aschehoug. 2 kr. 50.

Markowitz, A., Die Weltanschauung H. Ibsens. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 6 M.

Niedner, F., Islands Kultur zur Wikingerzeit. (Thule, Altnordische Dichtung und Prosa, Einleitungsband.) Jena, Diederichs. 4 M. 50.

Ordbok öfver svenska språket. Utg. af Svenska akademien. Haefte 47. Lund, Gleerup. 1 kr. 50.

Schaefer, H., Waffenstudien zur Thidrekssaga. (Acta Germanica.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 2 M. 50.

Schück, H., och K. Warburg, Illustrerad svensk litteraturhistoria. 2. uppl. II. Stockholm, Geber.

Sveriges Nationallitteratur, 1500–1900. I. Reformationstiden, utg. af H. Schück. XVIII. A. C. Leffler ; E. Ahlgren ; A. Agrell etc. utg. af R. G. Berg. Stockholm, Bonnier. Each 2 kr.

Dutch, Flemish.

Flos vnde Blankeflos. Kritische Ausgabe des mittelniederdeutschen Gedichts von O. Decker. Rostock, Kaufungen-Verlag. 3 M. 50.

Gezelle, G., Dichtwerken. 2 Dln. Amsterdam, L. J. Veen. 20 fl.

Hendrik van Veldeke, Sint Servatius legende. Bewerkt door M. Koenen. Bussum, P. Brand. 60 c.

Peletier, W. C. E., Jacoba van Beieren in het Nederlandsche treuerspel. Nijmegen, Robijns. 2 fl.

English.

(*a*) *General.*

Hudson, W. H., An Outline History of English Literature. London, Bell 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Petri, A., Übersicht über die im Jahre 1905 auf dem Gebiete der englischen Philologie erschienenen Bücher, Schriften und Aufsätze. (Anglia, XXX, Suppl.-Heft.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 6 M.

Spira, T., Die englische Lautentwicklung nach französischen Grammatiker-Zeugnissen. (Quellen und Forschungen, CXV.) Strassburg, Trübner. 8 M.

(*b*) *Modern English.*

Bleibtreu, K., Das Byron-Geheimnis. Münich, G. Müller. 3 M.

Choisy, L. F., Alfred Tennyson, son spiritualisme, sa personnalité morale. Paris, H. Champion. 6 fr.

Cook, E. T., Homes and Haunts of John Ruskin. London, G. Allen. 21*s.* net.

Crotch, W. W., Charles Dickens, social reformer. London, Chapman and Hall. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Daniel, J., Les idées sociales de Ruskin. Paris, Bloud et Cie. 3 fr. 50.

Dickens, C., The Complete Mystery of Edwin Drood : the History, Continuations and Solutions, 1870–1912. Ed. by J. Cuming Walters. London, Chapman and Hall. 6*s.* net.

Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by S. Lee. Second Supplement, Vol. III., Neil-Young. London, Smith, Elder. 15*s.* net.

Fuess, C. M., Lord Byron as a Satirist in Verse. London, Frowde. 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hardy, T., Works. Wessex Edition. Verse. Vols. II, III. London, Macmillan. Each 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Higginson, J. J., Spenser's Shepherd's Calender in relation to contemporary affairs. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hopkins, R. T., Oscar Wilde: a study of the man and his work. London, Lynwood. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hulbert, J. R., Chaucer's Official Life. Univ. of Chicago Dissertation. Menasha, Wis., Collegiate Press.

Keble, J., Lectures on Poetry, 1832–41. Translated by E. K. Francis. 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Kitchen, G., Sir Roger L'Estrange: a contribution to the history of the Press in the seventeenth century. London, K. Paul. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Legouis, E., Geoffrey Chaucer. London, Dent. 5*s.* net.

Leonard, R. M., The Pageant of English Prose. Oxford Edition. London, Frowde. 2*s.*

Lirondelle, A., Shakespeare en Russie (1748–1840). Étude de littérature comparée. Paris, Hachette. 5 fr.

Longfellow, H. W., Hiawatha, The Courtship of Miles Standish, and other poems. (World's Classics.) London, H. Frowde. 1*s.* net.

Lunn, A. H. M., The Englishman in the Alps: a collection of English prose and poetry relating to Switzerland. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

Massinger, Ph., Dramas, edited by L. A. Sherman. (Masterpieces of English Drama.) New York, American Book Co.

Melville, L., The Life and Letters of William Cobbett in England and America. 2 vols. London, J. Lane. 32*s.* net.

Naylor, E. W., Shakespeare Music: Music of the Period. London, Curwen. 6*s.* net.

Poe, E. A., Le poesie, tradotte da F. Olivero. Bari, Laterza. 4 L.

Primitiae: Essays on English Literature, by Students of the University of Liverpool. London, Constable. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Quiller-Couch, A., The Oxford Book of Victorian Verse. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6*s.* net.

Ransome, A., Portraits and Speculations. London, Macmillan. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Sandberg, L., Charles Dickens. 1812–1912. Christiania, H. Aschehoug. 5 kr.

Schofeld, W. H., Chivalry in English Literature. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, II.) Cambridge, Mass. (London, H. Frowde). 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Shakespearean Addresses. delivered at the Arts Club, Manchester, 1886–1912. Ed. by Lieut.-Col. Fishwick. Manchester, Sherratt and Hughes. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Shakespeare, W., Werke, englisch and deutsch. (Tempel-Klassiker.) Vols. I, II. Leipzig, Tempel-Verlag. Each 3 M.

Shakespeare, W., The Tragedy of Richard II. Edited by I. B. John. (Arden Edition.) London, Methuen. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Spenser, E., Poetical Works. Edited with critical notes by J. C. Smith and E. de Sélincourt. Oxford Edition. London, H. Frowde. 2*s.*

Stephens, W. H., Introduction to the Study of English Literature: its history and form. London, Macmillan. 1*s.* 4*d.* net.

Swift, J., Correspondence. Edited by F. E. Ball. Vol. iv. London, Bell. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Tennyson, A., Poems published in 1842. (Oxford Library of Prose and Poetry.) London, H. Frowde. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Thomas, E., A. C. Swinburne: a Critical Study. London, M. Secker. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Williams, W. H., Dryden's Preface to the Fables. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10*d.*

Wood, F. A., Some Parallel Formations in English. (Hesperia, Ergänzungsreihe, 1. Heft.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 2 M. 40.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

Andresen, K. G., Sprachgebrauch und Sprachrichtigkeit im Deutschen. 10. Aufl. herausg. von F. Söhns. Leipzig, O. R. Reisland. 6 M.

Golther, W., Die deutsche Dichtung, 800–1500. (Epochen der deutschen Literatur.) Stuttgart, J. B. Metzler. 8 M.

Hahn, L., Die Ausbreitung der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache in Ostfriesland. (Teutonia, xxiv.) Leipzig, Avenarius. 6 M.

Henrici, E., Sprachmischung in älterer Dichtung Deutschlands. Berlin, J. Klönne. 5 M.

Salzer, A., Illustrierte Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. 2 Bände. Munich, Allgemeine Verlags-Gesellschaft. 40 M.

Scholl, K., Die Mundarten des Kreises Ottweiler. Untersuchungen auf lautphysiologischer und sprachgeschichtlicher Grundlage. Strassburg, Trübner. 3 M. 50.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Brietzmann, F., Die böse Frau in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters. (Palaestra, xlii.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 7 M.

Laurin. Ein tirolisches Heldenmärchen aus dem Anfange des 13. Jahrh. Herausg. von K. Müllenhoff. 4te Aufl. von M. Roediger. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 M.

Mai, E., Das mittelhochdeutsche Gedicht vom Mönch Felix, auf textkritischer Grundlage untersucht und erklärt. (Acta Germanica, iv.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 15 M.

Mansion, J., Althochdeutsches Lesebuch für Anfänger. (Germanische Bibliothek, i, iii, 3. Band.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M. 40.

Petzet, E., and O. Glauning, Deutsche Schrifttafeln des 9.—16. Jahrh. aus Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München. iii. Abt. Proben der höfischen Lyrik. (13. und 14. Jahrh.) Munich, C. Kuhn. 8 M.

Spitta, F., Das deutsche Kirchenlied, in seinen charakteristischen Erscheinungen ausgewählt. i. Mittelalter und Reformationszeit. (Sammlung Göschen, 602.) Berlin, G. J. Göschen. 80 pf.

Stricker, Der, Der Pfaffe Amis. Ein illustrierter Strassburger Wiegendruck. (Seltenheiten aus süddeutschen Bibliotheken, i.) Munich, C. Kuhn. 20 M.

Warnung, Die. Eine Reimpredigt aus dem 13. Jahrh. Herausg. von L. Weber. (Münchener Archiv für Philologie des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, i.) Munich, Callwey. 7 M. 50.

Wesle, C., Die althochdeutschen Glossen des Schlettstädter Codex zu kirchlichen Schriften und ihre Verwandten. (Untersuchungen zur deutschen Sprachgeschichte, III.) Strassburg, Trübner. 4 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Arens, E., A. von Droste-Hülshoff. Westfälische Skizzen und Landschaften. Münster, Aschendorff. 2 M.

Auerbach, B., Werke. In Auswahl herausg. von A. Bettelheim. 15 Bände. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 6 M.

Becker, A., Die Sprache Friedrichs von Spee. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 5 M.

Blum, J., La vie et l'œuvre de J. G. Hamann, le 'Mage du Nord' (1730–88). (Bibl. de philologie et de littérature modernes.) Paris, Alcan. 4 fr.

Brant, S., Das Narrenschiff. Faksimile der Erstausgabe von 1494. (Jahresgaben der Gesellschaft für elsässische Literatur, I.) Strassburg, Trübner. 15 M.

Brentano, C., Sämtliche Werke. Bd. XIV, ii. Munich, G. Müller. 6 M.

Caroline. Briefe aus der Frühromantik. Nach G. Waitz vermehrt herausg. von E. Schmidt. 2 Bände. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 12 M.

Chamberlain, H. S., Goethe. Munich, F. Bruckmann. 16 M.

Dosenheimer, E., F. Hebbels Auffassung vom Staat und sein Trauerspiel 'Agnes Bernauer.' (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte, XIII.) Leipzig, Haessel. 4 M. 60.

Eichendorff, J. von, Gesammelte Werke. IV. Band. Munich, G. Müller. 6 M.

Farinelli, A., Paul Heyse. Munich, Süddeutsche Monatshefte. 1 M. 50.

Fischer, F., Basedow und Lavater in ihren persönlichen und literarischen Beziehungen zueinander. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. 3 M.

Fortunati Glückseckel und Wunschhütlein, herausg. nach dem ältesten erhaltenen Druck, Augsburg, 1509, von R. Benz. (Die deutschen Volksbücher.) Jena, Diedrichs. 4 M.

Goedeke, K., Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung. 2. Aufl., 29. Heft, und 3. Aufl. IV. Band, 3. Abt. Dresden, Ehlermann. 7 M. 20 and 22 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Faust, Erster Teil. Herausg. von H. Lebede. Berlin, F. Lehmann. 8 M.

Götze, A., Frühneuhochdeutsches Glossar. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, CI.) Bonn, Marcus und Weber. 3 M. 40.

Grillparzer-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der. XXI.—XXIII. Jahrg. Vienna, C. Konegen. Each 12 kr.

Grimm, Brüder, Kinder- und Hausmärchen. Jubiläums-Auflage besorgt von R. Steig. Stuttgart, Cotta. 5 M.

Gubelmann, A., Studies in the Lyric Poems of F. Hebbel. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press (London, H. Frowde). 10*s.* net.

Hebbel, F., Sämtliche Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe besorgt von R. M. Werner. I. Abt., 7., 8. und 14. Bd. Berlin, Behr. Each 2 M. 50.

Helmrich, E. W., The History of the Chorus in the German Drama. (Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press (London, H. Frowde). 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Herder, J. F., Shakespeare-Aufsatz in dreifacher Gestalt. Herausg. von F. Zinkernagel. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, CVII.) Bonn Marcus und Weber. 1 M.

Herzog, R., Die schlesischen Musenalmanache von 1773–1823. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, xxiii.) Breslau, F. Hirt. 3 M. 80.

Hopf, W., August Vilmar. Ein Lebens- und Zeitbild. i. Band. Marburg, Elwert. 6 M.

Jaffé, W., Alexander Baumann (1814–57). Ein Beitrag zum Wiener literarischen Vormärz und zum volkstümlichen Lied in Österreich. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, xlii.) Weimar, A. Duncker. 9 M. 60.

Kästner, A. G., Briefe aus sechs Jahrzehnten (1745–1800). Berlin, B. Behr. 6 M.

Kettner, G., Goethes Nausikaa. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 M. 60.

Klinger, F. M., Dramatische Jugendwerke, herausg. von H. Berendt und K. Wolff. i. Band. Leipzig, Rowohlt. 7 M.

Klingner, E., Luther und der deutsche Volksaberglaube. (Palaestra, lvi.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M.

Kohlbrugge, J. H. F., Historisch-kritische Studien über Goethe als Naturforscher. Würzburg, Kabitzsch. 3 M.

Köster, A., Die allgemeinen Tendenzen der Geniebewegung im 18. Jahrh. (Progr.) Leipzig, A. Edelmann. 1 M. 50.

Kralik, D., and F. Lemmermayer, Neue Hebbel-Dokumente. Berlin, Schuster und Loeffler. 4 M.

Kuberka, F., Der Idealismus Schillers als Erlebnis und Lehre. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 4 M. 20.

Kühn, J., Der junge Goethe im Spiegel der Dichtung seiner Zeit. (Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, i.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 50.

Leitzmann, A., W. von Humboldts Sonettdichtung. Bonn, Marcus und Weber. 2 M. 80.

Lenz, J. M. R., Gesammelte Schriften. Herausg. von F. Blei. v. Band. Munich, G. Müller. 7 M. 50.

Lienhart, F., Einführung in Goethes Faust. (Wissenschaft und Bildung, cxvi.) Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 1 M.

Ludwig, O., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von P. Merker. i. und ii. Band. Munich, G. Müller. Each 6 M.

Meissner, C., C. Spitteler. Zur Einführung in sein Schaffen. Jena, Diederichs. 2 M.

Méjasson, J., Le sentiment religieux dans les poésies d'Uhland. Paris, H. Champion. 4 fr.

Montgomery-Silfverstolpe, M., Das romantische Deutschland. Reisejournal einer Schwedin (1825–26). Leipzig, Bonnier. 6 M.

Müller, Mahler, Der Faun Molon. Eine Idylle. Nach der Hs. herausg. von O. Heuer. (Aus dem Frankfurter Goethemuseum, ii.) Leipzig, Rowohlt. 6 M. 50.

Musæus, J. K. A., Volksmärchen der Deutschen. Herausg. von P. Zaunert. 2 Bände. Jena, Diederichs. 6 M.

Reynold, G. de, Histoire littéraire de la Suisse au xviii^{e} siècle. Bodmer et l'école suisse. Paris, Fischbacher. 18 fr.

Schier, A., Die Liebe in der Frühromantik mit besonderer Rücksicht des Romans. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, xx.) Marburg, Elwert. 4 M.

Schiller, F. von, Sämtliche Werke. (Horenausgabe.) viii. Band. Munich G. Müller. 5 M.

Schmidt, H., Goethe-Lexikon. Leipzig, A. Kröner. 5 M.

Schrenck, E. von, Richard Wagner als Dichter. Munich, C. H. Beck. 4 M.

Simmel, G., Goethe. Leipzig, Klinkhardt und Biermann. 4 M.

Spiero, H., Geschichte der deutschen Frauendichtung seit 1800. (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 390.) Leipzig, Teubner. 1 M.

Stecher, G., Jung-Stilling als Schriftsteller. (Palaestra, cxx.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 7 M. 80.

Steinweg, C., Goethes Seelendramen und ihre französischen Vorlagen. Halle, Niemeyer. 7 M.

Strich, F., Schiller. Sein Leben und sein Werk. Leipzig, Tempel Verlag. 3 M.

Weise, A., Die Entwicklung des Fühlens und Denkens der Romantik auf Grund der romantischen Zeitschriften. (Beiträge zur Kultur- und Universalgeschichte, xxiii.) Leipzig, R. Voigtländer. 6 M.

Wildenbruch, E. von, Gesammelte Werke. Herausg. von B. Litzmann. 3. und 8. Bd. Berlin, Grote. Each 4 M.

Wohnlich, O., Tiecks Einfluss auf Immermann. (Sprache und Dichtung, xi.) Tübingen, Mohr. 3 M.

Wood, H., Faust-Studien. Berlin, G. Reimer. 6 M.